



**LEGEND to FIGs-A.1/A.2:** The first purpose of the 4 FIGs A.c-d & A.g-h is to show for a fictional concrete <sup>IDL</sup>ETCI<sup>2.a)</sup> — in A.g-h, i.e. in some KR<sup>rat/mat</sup> — that the application on it of the FSTP-Test (in an exemplary A.c-d-KR) is trivial.

For any ETCI any of the remaining 4 KR<sup>s2.a)</sup> is untenable, i.e. is only didactically<sup>1.a)</sup> useful, as it uses non-refined claiming and thus can't warrant this ETCI's limited preemptivity<sup>b)</sup>, i.e. its PE — while refined claiming may render it SPL-satisfying, comprising its PE. I.e.: For intuitively conveying this triviality with any concrete <sup>IDL</sup>ETCI, especially as to its PE, its FIGs A.e-f resp. A.a-b (enabling only classically claiming KR<sup>s</sup> for it resp. its SPL-test<sup>c)</sup>) are used to visualize the legal errors any classical claiming inevitably may commit by deviating from the refined claiming required by the Supreme Court's *MBA*-framework.

Thus: A.a-b show by example for some non-refined (= non-rational) classical SPL-test, denoted by "pre-FSTP"-test, and A.c-d the refined (rational or even mathematical) FSTP-Test using some English and/or mathematical IDL-Subset — totaling

- A.a:** As its DE/PE/PA is not IDL implemented<sup>a)</sup>, it — as classical claim construction — is vastly incomplete, evidenced by A.c.
- A.b:** It is the CAFC's current claim construction in *Enfish* and *TLI* — and A.c again evidences its incompleteness.
- A.c:** It is the rational claim construction — requiring an also rational claim interpretation, but for this it is evidently trivial<sup>d)</sup>.
- A.d:** KR of the ETCI has the same properties as the A.c-KR — yet it is semi-automatic because of its being mathematical<sup>A.2)</sup>.

## A.2 This Triviality of Specifying ETCIs and of their FSTP-Test's Use Enables their Semi-Automatic

The 4 KR<sup>s</sup>: A.e-g/h show of 1 abstract (= structurallyconcrete) COM(ETCI) 3 substantially different <sup>IDL</sup>KR<sup>s</sup>.

<p><b>&lt;A.e: pre-MBA claim interpretation of ETCI in: metaphysical KR = pre-MBA-KR = classical claiming KR<sup>mpphys</sup>&gt;</b>                  COM(ETCI)<sup>mpphys</sup> ≡ O-clC0S<sup>mpphys</sup> is ETCI's set of                  'O-clC0S<sup>mpphys</sup> ::= {O-clC0n ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by O-MUIS0n<sup>mpphys</sup> ::= {n-IDL-sentences<sup>mpphys</sup>, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}'                  output 'COM(ETCI)<sup>mpphys</sup> allegedly satisfies SPL if passes whatsoever freestyle alleged SPL-test' ∧ stop.</p>	<p>input ∧ begin:                  'O-clC0S<sup>mpphys</sup> ::= {O-clC0n ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by O-MUIS0n<sup>mpphys</sup> ::= {n-IDL-sentences<sup>mpphys</sup>, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}' ∪                  'A-crC0S<sup>mpphys</sup> ::= {A-crC0n ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by A-MUIS0n<sup>mpphys</sup> ::= {n-IDL-sentences<sup>mpphys</sup>, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}' ∪                  'E-crC0S<sup>mpphys</sup> ::= {E-inC0k ∨ E-ninC0k ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by E-MUIS0k<sup>mpphys</sup> ::= {k-IDL-sentences<sup>mpphys</sup>, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}' ∪                  'E-crC0S<sup>mat</sup> ::= {E-inC0k ∨ E-ninC0k axiomized mathematically by k-IDL-sentences<sup>math</sup>, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}' ∪                  'E-crC0S<sup>mat</sup>_DEF ::= {E-inC0k ∨ E-ninC0k axiomized mathematically by k-IDL-sentences<sup>math</sup>, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}' ∪                  output 'COM(ETCI)<sup>mat</sup> satisfies SPL mathematically proven if passes FSTP-Test in KR<sup>mat</sup>' ∧ stop.</p>
<p><b>&lt;A.f: mrat claim interpretation of ETCI in: metarational KR = post-Mayo/pre-Alice-KR = incomplete FSTP KR<sup>mrat</sup>&gt;</b>                  COM(ETCI)<sup>mrat</sup> ≡ O-/A-crC0S<sup>mrat</sup> is ETCI's set of                  'O-crC0S<sup>mrat</sup> ::= {O-crC0n ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by O-MUIS0n<sup>mrat</sup> ::= {n-IDL-sentences<sup>mrat</sup>, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}' ∪                  'A-crC0S<sup>mrat</sup> ::= {A-crC0n ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by A-MUIS0n<sup>mrat</sup> ::= {n-IDL-sentences<sup>mrat</sup>, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}' ∪                  output 'COM(ETCI)<sup>mrat</sup> allegedly satisfies SPL if passes whatsoever freestyle alleged SPL-test' ∧ stop.</p>	<p>input ∧ begin:                  'O-crC0S<sup>mrat</sup> ::= {O-crC0n ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by O-MUIS0n<sup>mrat</sup> ::= {n-IDL-sentences<sup>mrat</sup>, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}' ∪                  'A-crC0S<sup>mrat</sup> ::= {A-crC0n ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by A-MUIS0n<sup>mrat</sup> ::= {n-IDL-sentences<sup>mrat</sup>, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}' ∪                  'E-crC0S<sup>mrat</sup> ::= {E-inC0k ∨ E-ninC0k ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by E-MUIS0k<sup>mrat</sup> ::= {k-IDL-sentences<sup>mrat</sup>, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}' ∪                  'E-crC0S<sup>mat</sup> ::= {E-inC0k ∨ E-ninC0k axiomized mathematically by k-IDL-sentences<sup>math</sup>, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}' ∪                  'E-crC0S<sup>mat</sup>_DEF ::= {E-inC0k ∨ E-ninC0k axiomized mathematically by k-IDL-sentences<sup>math</sup>, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}' ∪                  output 'COM(ETCI)<sup>mat</sup> satisfies SPL mathematically proven if passes FSTP-Test in KR<sup>mat</sup>' ∧ stop.</p>
<p><b>&lt;A.g: rat claim interpretation in: rational KR = post-MBA-KR = refined claiming KR<sup>rat</sup> = FSTP KR<sup>rat</sup>&gt;</b>                  COM(ETCI)<sup>rat</sup> ≡ O-/A-/E-crC0S<sup>rat</sup> is ETCI's set of                  'O-crC0S<sup>rat</sup> ::= {O-crC0n ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by O-MUIS0n<sup>rat</sup> ::= {n-IDL-sentences<sup>rat</sup>, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}' ∪                  'A-crC0S<sup>rat</sup> ::= {A-crC0n ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by A-MUIS0n<sup>rat</sup> ::= {n-IDL-sentences<sup>rat</sup>, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}' ∪                  'E-crC0S<sup>rat</sup> ::= {E-inC0k ∨ E-ninC0k ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by E-MUIS0k<sup>rat</sup> ::= {k-IDL-sentences<sup>rat</sup>, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}' ∪                  output 'COM(ETCI)<sup>rat</sup> satisfies SPL if passes FSTP-Test in KR<sup>rat</sup>' ∧ stop.</p>	<p>input ∧ begin:                  'O-crC0S<sup>rat</sup> ::= {O-crC0n ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by O-MUIS0n<sup>rat</sup> ::= {n-IDL-sentences<sup>rat</sup>, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}' ∪                  'A-crC0S<sup>rat</sup> ::= {A-crC0n ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by A-MUIS0n<sup>rat</sup> ::= {n-IDL-sentences<sup>rat</sup>, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}' ∪                  'E-crC0S<sup>rat</sup> ::= {E-inC0k ∨ E-ninC0k ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by E-MUIS0k<sup>rat</sup> ::= {k-IDL-sentences<sup>rat</sup>, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}' ∪                  'E-crC0S<sup>mat</sup> ::= {E-inC0k ∨ E-ninC0k axiomized mathematically by k-IDL-sentences<sup>math</sup>, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}' ∪                  'E-crC0S<sup>mat</sup>_DEF ::= {E-inC0k ∨ E-ninC0k axiomized mathematically by k-IDL-sentences<sup>math</sup>, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}' ∪                  output 'COM(ETCI)<sup>mat</sup> satisfies SPL mathematically proven if passes FSTP-Test in KR<sup>mat</sup>' ∧ stop.</p>
<p><b>&lt;A.h: mat claim interpretation in: mathematical KR = post-MBA-KR = refined claiming KR<sup>mat</sup> = FSTP KR<sup>mat</sup>&gt;</b>                  COM(ETCI)<sup>mat</sup> ≡ O-/A-/E-crC0S<sup>mat</sup> is ETCI's set of                  'O-crC0S<sup>mat</sup> ::= {O-crC0n ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by O-MUIS0n<sup>mat</sup> ::= {n-IDL-sentences<sup>mat</sup>, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}' ∪                  'A-crC0S<sup>mat</sup> ::= {A-crC0n ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by A-MUIS0n<sup>mat</sup> ::= {n-IDL-sentences<sup>mat</sup>, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}' ∪                  'E-crC0S<sup>mat</sup> ::= {E-inC0k ∨ E-ninC0k ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by E-MUIS0k<sup>mat</sup> ::= {k-IDL-sentences<sup>mat</sup>, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}' ∪                  'E-crC0S<sup>mat</sup>_DEF ::= {E-inC0k ∨ E-ninC0k axiomized mathematically by k-IDL-sentences<sup>math</sup>, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}' ∪                  output 'COM(ETCI)<sup>mat</sup> satisfies SPL mathematically proven if passes FSTP-Test in KR<sup>mat</sup>' ∧ stop.</p>	<p>input ∧ begin:                  'O-crC0S<sup>mat</sup> ::= {O-crC0n ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by O-MUIS0n<sup>mat</sup> ::= {n-IDL-sentences<sup>mat</sup>, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}' ∪                  'A-crC0S<sup>mat</sup> ::= {A-crC0n ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by A-MUIS0n<sup>mat</sup> ::= {n-IDL-sentences<sup>mat</sup>, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}, 1 ≤ n ≤ N}' ∪                  'E-crC0S<sup>mat</sup> ::= {E-inC0k ∨ E-ninC0k ::= IDL-sentence, disclosed by E-MUIS0k<sup>mat</sup> ::= {k-IDL-sentences<sup>mat</sup>, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}' ∪                  'E-crC0S<sup>mat</sup>_DEF ::= {E-inC0k ∨ E-ninC0k axiomized mathematically by k-IDL-sentences<sup>math</sup>, 1 ≤ k ≤ K}' ∪                  output 'COM(ETCI)<sup>mat</sup> satisfies SPL mathematically proven if passes FSTP-Test in KR<sup>mat</sup>' ∧ stop.</p>

**4 FIGs-A.2:** The first line in the boxes FIGs A.e-f indicates some classical claim interpretation; FIGs A.g-h show the refined claim interpretation, i.e. the FSTP-Test-claiming. For A.e-h holds the above A.a-d, too — adjusted properly.

<sup>2.a</sup> **IDL-Axiom:** An "IDL" is any subset of any natural language that is next to trivial, yet comprises elementary Mathematics just as the set of all notions that the Supreme Court by its *MBA*-framework ex- or implicitly requires to be used in legally deciding on an ETCI's SPL satisfaction (not comprising the notions DE/PE/PA — standing for the *MBA*-framework notions of 'definiteness'/patent eligibility'/patentability'). Thus, an IDL is a **Domain-specific Language, DSL**<sup>[371]</sup> for drafting and/or using (e.g. testing) <sup>IDL</sup>ETCIs.

**b.** An ETCI is called "limited preemptive" if it is able to preempt only ETCI's embedding the same nPE TT0 as the ETCI, yet dealing with a substantially different TT0 application, A\*, that to TT0 is related the same way as the A also embedded by the ETCI.

**c.** All terms within all boxes A.a-h belong to IDL — i.e. obey an IDL grammar, always describable by an (E)BNF<sup>[370,392]</sup> and are lexically, syntactically, and semantically global for all FSTP-Tests, also partially global and partially ETCI-specific for all ETCIs — or require during execution of the FSTP-Test interpretation by the human tester or alike. Thereby an ETCI<sup>rat/mat</sup> requires an ETCI-specific lexical/syntactical/semantical IDL extension, defined by the ETCI specification as shown in FIGs A.g-h by the DEF-terms.

**d.** The notion of "claiming" comprises both notions, claim-interpretation just as claim-construction. Any ETCI's SPL satisfiability test is defined to comprise both checks, the ETCI's claim-interpretation for determining the ETCI's meaning (comprising its notional identification and concretization), and the ETCI's claim-construction for determining the ETCI's satisfying SPL. Therefore, for evident logical reasons the notion of claim-construction comprises that of claim-interpretation: This is necessary for making the ETCI's SPL test meaningful. This makes the notion of the ETCI's 'claim-construction' to be synonymous with the ETCI's 'SPL satisfiability test' — and hence the notion of 'the ETCI's claim-interpretation' to be an indispensable part of the notion of 'the ETCI's SPL satisfiability test'.

All this holds for the FSTP-Test, too. Nevertheless it is here decomposed into these two parts — in spite of their properties' total inter-meshing with each other<sup>[354]FIG1</sup> — for facilitating intuitively grasping also those of an ETCI's SPL-relevant yet filigree separable properties, also of its SPL-satisfaction test, and of the *MBA*-framework that currently are broadly not yet completely understood by the patent community.

Once one is intuitively familiar with these post-*MBA* and separable properties of an ETCI, of its SPL-satisfiability test, and of the Supreme Court's refined SPL-interpretation as unconditionally implied by its *MBA*-framework, one is intuitively familiar also with the FSTP-Test and its analyzing an ETCI and would immediately intuitively recognize: Passing the FSTP-Test is for an ETCI necessary&ufficient for satisfying SPL.

This recognition is any ETCI's FSTP-Test may be modeled as an ETCI-stereotypic and logically straightforward metarational or even mathematical construct of 'finite first order logic, FFOL'. Namely: A stereotypically reoccurring •ETCI-specific simple logical structure made-up from a conjunction of N combinations of conjunctions of subsets of a finite set of K elementary predicates in total describing the respective properties of these N elements of this ETCI<sup>[5-8]</sup>, another •for all ETCIs uniform simple logical structure made-up from a conjunction of 4 combinations (defined by the 4 §§112/101/102/103 of 35 USC) of simple conjunctions of subsets of 10 elementary predicates in total describing the properties of the SPL-requirements stated by the *MBA*-framework that this ETCI is to meet necessarily&ufficiently for satisfying SPL, and •the requirement that this ETCI-description just as this SPL- alias FSTP-Test requirement statement is to be based on the inventive concept(s) of this ETCI. Hence, due to the stereotypicity and straightforwardness of this FFOL logical set-up of any ETCI's FSTP-Test it is justified to call it trivial — as it comprises nothing but routine work that is so simple that it is vastly automatable.

Thereby this routine work is additionally greatly facilitated alias trivialized by IDL<sup>a)</sup>, itself a trivial but here extremely powerful English subset.

**LEGEND to FIGs-A.2/A.1:** Any metarational  $IDL$ -ETCI, i.e. its  $A$ - $crC0S^{mrat}$  and  $E$ - $crC0S^{mrat}$  — and the more rational and mathematical  $IDL$ -ETCI — is trivially automatically translatable into a conjunction of its elementary mathematical  $IDL$ -sentences/expressions that consequently embody its metaphysical items — as visualized by A.f-h. The term  $E$ - $crC0S^{mat\_DEF}$  in A.h is thereby denoting the mathematical library capable of translating any of the above abstract  $E$ - $crC$ -names of the abstract  $COM(ETCI)$  into its concrete name of the concrete  $COM(ETCI)$ .

This 'math-lib' is generated by the inventor/drafter of the ETCI (as outlined here) before and/or during construing the claim-interpretation of a concrete ETCI such that holds  $A$ - $crC0n = \bigwedge_{1 \leq k \leq K} (E$ - $inC0nk \vee E$ - $ninC0nk)$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq K$  — whereby initially  $COM(ETCI) = \Phi$ , then = incomplete, and eventually = complete — as seen by the inventor/drafter and  $pposc^b$ ). When testing a concrete  $COM(ETCI)$  of a concrete ETCI for its SPL-satisfaction by construing its claim-construction by its inventor/drafter/analyzer/.../licensee/.../judge the  $COM(ETCI)$  is evidently available, stored somewhere, and input into A.a-d from there.

This just outlined  $IDL$ -enabled — for an ETCI's universe & its RS “axiomatic” — “mathematization of its creative increments” in A.g-h has also vastly so mathematized the FSTP-Test in the KR's A.c-d, too. Three remarks are in place here:

- The  $IDL$ -FSTP-Test in KR's A.c-d refers in its test1-test3 and test8<sup>3.d)</sup> to the ETCI, while FSTP.test9 is depending on RS and hence is not mathematizable by the ETCI — which works with test3. But all 4 tests are axiomatically mathematizable the same way, yet require human  $IDL$ -input defining the knowledge needed by the FSTP-Test.
- Once all 10 FSTP-testo,  $1 \leq o \leq 10$ , have been axiomatically mathematized, supported by  $IDL$ , the whole FSTP-Test runs fully automatically — which greatly supports reiteratively adjusting all preceding definitions by the inventor/drafter/...
- Note that the preceding definitions comprise the for an ETCI unavoidable exceptional  $E$ - $crC$ s, i.e. their above outlined local but axiomatic mathematization — a cognition hardly by anybody expected<sup>3.c)</sup>.

The LEGEND to FIGs-A.2/A.1 ends this ANNEX about the triviality and semi-automatability of using the FSTP-Test by sketching how to mathematize the  $E$ - $IDL$ - $crC0S^{mrat\_DEF}$ s of an ETCI. As this process establishes in Patent/Innovation Technology<sup>[182]</sup> a breakthrough of its own, it deserves a final footnote.<sup>3.a)</sup>

It is important here, as to a reader this procedure may seem complicated, over-sophisticated, if not principally somewhat obscure — on his/her first encounter with this by axiomizing achieved total separation of Transcendence/Metaphysics from Rationality, though only with drafting/testing an ETCI's patent for absolute robustness but also here never heard before. Yet, this is not true. It is namely extremely successfully practiced since ever<sup>c)</sup>. This proves that the human brain is capable of sub-cortically dealing with alias practicing it, i.e. without being aware of what it is doing in detail. This enables the IES to expose to the inventor/drafter/examiner/judge/... of an ETCI an accordingly simplified user interface<sup>[268]</sup>.

It is the lack of this rigor of thinking in the CAFC's opinions — being the basis of System Design — that prevents their fully meeting the requirements that the Supreme Court stated by its *MBA*-framework<sup>[400]</sup>.

<sup>3.a</sup> This footnote provides in<sup>3.c)</sup> — in telegram style — some historic context to the preceding elaborations (ending by outlining the axiomatic mathematization of a metarational ETCI), requiring some more familiarity with FSTP-Technology that is presented first. For more details see<sup>[401]</sup>.

Mathematically refined claiming of/for an ETCI evidently is based on its rationally/refined claiming, as the Rationality is not implied by Mathematics — which solely latter renders Rationality as (semi-)automatable, yet the executed  $IDL$ -code may produce wrong results.

A concrete ETCI in classical KR, i.e. its non-refined claiming, need neither be of Metarationality<sup>1.c)</sup> (describable by predicates written in  $IDL$ ), nor does it comprise the semiotic expansion of the SPL interpretation by the Supreme Court's *MBA* framework in favor of ETCIs.

Here is not assumed that in future patents the ETCIs' classical claims' wordings would disappear, but just the coarse conjectures about them — in particular if relevant for their *MBA*-framework interpretation<sup>[354,355]</sup> — that has fooled the patent community since this framework. In hindsight it is evident for everybody that it is really Solomonic. Yet, it is also true that it is indeed nontrivial to grasp, especially that the notion 'KR' of an ETCI onto thinking about this ETCI's robust protection by SPL is so substantial — as the research in the FSTP-Project has shown.

<sup>b</sup>  $pposc$  = “person of pertinent ordinary skill and creativity”.

<sup>c</sup> The DEF clause axiomizes mathematically the ETCI-specific exceptional just as ordinary notions, any non-ETCI-specific notions are considered to be so 'pre-mathematized' by the IES<sup>[351]</sup> or  $IDL$ . I.e.: This encapsulation alias axiomization of the metaphysical item of a meta-rational notion takes place by defining in  $IDL$  its 'truth sets', naming it, and defining in  $IDL$  this names relations to other rational items. Thereafter one may deal with this name as if it represented as defined, i.e. as if it were from the outset a rational item.

The probably best known such encapsulation of a transcendent item into Mathematics is the notion “ $i$ ” denoting  $\sqrt{-1}$ : Its axiomization basically defined that  $(\sqrt{-1})^{**2} ::= -1$ , and for  $i$  its relations to real numbers by the pairs of real numbers representing the respective well-known complex numbers. Hearsay tells that Gauß initially didn't know what to think about this intellectual construct of “complex numbers” but later made peace with it and consolidated it. Indeed, this intellectual mechanism of abstracting from items of Metaphysic/Transcendence by encapsulating them into Rationality, i.e. disguising them to be pure Rationality, is ubiquitously practiced by the human brain without letting us know. The human brain practices it since ever — see the natural numbers (“1,2,3,...”), the equal sign (“=”), the zero (“0”), ..., all letters/words/meanings/... — in particular any scientific cognition as well as any reasonable behavior (such as driving a car, riding a bike, ...).

Returning to the point: The same occurs with executing the FSTP-Test on an ETCI and (e.g. semi-automatically) evaluating it to “T”/“F”. In<sup>[390]</sup> this is called the “clou” of the §101/*Alice*-problem, and in<sup>[392]</sup> it will be demonstrated by the concrete *DDR*-ETCI.

<sup>d</sup> What is shown in A.c-d as FSTP.test3 and test8 is notionally seemingly closer to A.g-h of the ETCI's KR — i.e. *Biasig* is then absent from A.e-f test8 is not at all testable in A.e — and by time constraint cannot be clarified in V.16. If this should prove true, V.17 of this ANNEX, to be found on the FSTP-Project's blog, will have this notionally important but technically trivial deficiency fixed.

### The FSTP-Project's Reference List

FSTP = Facts Screening/Transforming/Presenting (Version of 09.07.2017)

Most of the FSTP-Project papers below are written in preparation of the textbook [182] – i.e. are not intended to be fully self-explanatory independent 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 Technologies' Inventions Now without Intricacies".

[2] AIT: "Advanced Information Technology" alias "Artificial Intelligence Technology" denotes cutting edge IT areas, e.g. Knowledge Representation(KR)/Description Logic (DL)/Natural Language (NL)/Semantics/Semiotics/System Design, just as MAI: "Mathematical Artificial Intelligence", the resilient fundament of AIT and "Facts Screening/Transforming/Presenting, FSTP"-Technology, developed in this FSTP-Project.

[5] S. Schindler: "Math. Model. Substantive. Patent Law (SPL) Top-Down vs. Bottom-Up", Yokohama, 2012, JURISIN 2017

[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?.

[9] a. S. Schindler, "Patent Business – Before Shake-up", 2013?.

b. S. Schindler, "Patent Business – Before Shake-up", 2015?.

c. S. Schindler, "Patent Business – Before Shake-up", 2017?.

[35] S. Schindler, IPR-MEMO: "Definitional Distinctions between – and Common Base Needed of – Subs. Trademark Law, Subs. Copyright Law, and Subs. Patent Law", in prep.

[37] D. Bey, C. Cotropia, "The Unreasonableness of the BRI Standard", AIPLA, 2009?.

[42] SSBG's Amicus Brief to the CAFC in case CLS, 06.12.2012?.

[64] B. Wegner, S. Schindler: "A Mathe. Structure Modeling Inventions", Coimbra, CICM-2014?.

[69] USSC, Transcript of the oral argument in *Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank*, 31.03.2014?.

[91] B. Wegner, S. Schindler: "A Math. KR Model for Refining Claim Interpret. & Constr.", in prep.

[113] S. Schindler: "The CAFC's Rebellion is Over – The USSC, by *Mayo/Biosig/Alice*, ...", published 07.08.2014?.

[160] S. Schindler: "The USSC *Mayo/Myriad/Alice* Decisions, The PTO's Implementation by its IEG, The CAFC's *DDR & Myriad* Recent Decisions", publ. 14.01.2015?, its short version?, and its PP presentation at USPTO, 21.01.2015?.

[163] S. Schindler: "The USSC's *Mayo/Myriad/Alice* Decisions: Their Overinterpret. vs. Oversight of ETCIs – Soc. of SPL Prec. as to ET CIs in Action: The CAFC's *Myriad* & CET Decisions", USPTO, 07.01.2015?.

[171] S. Schindler: "Semiotic Impacts of the Supreme Court's *Mayo/Biosig/Alice* Decisions on Leg. Anal. ETCIs".

[175] S. Schindler: "Patent's Robustness & 'Double Quantifying' Their InCs as of *Mayo/Alice*", WIPIP, USPTO&GWU, 06.02.2015?.

[182] S. Schindler: "Basics of Innovation-Theory and Substantive Patent Law Technology", Textbook, in prep.

[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?.

[214] K. O'Malley, "Pat. Lit. Case Man.: Reforming the Pat. Lit. Proc. ...", FCBA, 25.06.2015.

[215] R. Chen, "Claim Construct.", FCBA, 26.06.2015.

[217] S. Schindler: "The US NPS: The MBA Framework a Rough Diamond – but Rough for Ever? Teva will Cut this Diamond and thus Create a Mega-Trend in SPL, *Informat.*", publ. 21.07.2015?.

[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?", publ. 27.07.2015?.

[230] I. Kant: [https://en.wikipedia.com/wiki/Immanuel\\_Kant](https://en.wikipedia.com/wiki/Immanuel_Kant) & I. Kant: "Critique of Pure Reason", [https://en.wikipedia.com/wiki/I. Kant](https://en.wikipedia.com/wiki/I._Kant). I. Kant: "The Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science", Wikipedia.

[235] 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?.

[236] Concepts, <http://pat.stanford.edu/entries/concepts/>.

[237] S. Schindler: "The Supreme Court's Substantive Law (SPL) Interpretation – and Kant", publ. 13.04.2016?.

[238] R. Hanna: "Kant and the Foundations of Analytic Philosophy", OUP, 2001.

[241] S. Schindler: "Draft of an Amicus Brief to the USSC in *Cuozzo* supporting", publ. 05.11.2015?.

[243] M. Lee: Publ. Interview at Opening Plenary Session, AIPLA, DC, 21.10.2015.

[244] S. Schindler: "The IEG's 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.

[251] S. Schindler: "Patent-Eligibility and the 'Patent-Eligibility Granted-/ing, PEG' Test, resp. the CAFC Object. Counters the Supreme Court's MBA Framework by its *DDR* vs. *Myriad* *Cuozzo* Decisions", 05.01.2016?.

[252] E. Coe: "Michelle Lee Steers USPTO Through Choppy Waters", *Law360*, 09.12.2015?.

[257] S. Schindler: "A PS as to the Motion Decision ...", 11.01.2016?.

[258] S. Schindler: "BRI<sup>TO</sup> vs the USPTO or BRI<sup>MA</sup> by the Supreme Court?", 03.02.2016?.

[259] S. Schindler: "Classical Limitations or MBA Framework's Inventive Concepts?", 08.02.2016?.

[260] S. Schindler: "Patent-Eligibility, Vague Feelings or an MBA Fact?", publ. 12.02.2016?.

[261] S. Schindler, U. Diaz, T. Hofmann, L. Hunger, C. Negrutu, D. Schoenberg, J. Schultze, J. Wang, B. Wegner, R. Wetzler: "The User Interface Design of an Innovation Expert System (= IES) for Testing an Emerging Technology Claimed Invention (= ETI) for its Satisfying Substantive SPL", p. 07.03.2016?.

[264] W. Quine, see Wikipedia.

[267] S. Schindler: "IDL" pat. appl.: "THE IDL TOOLBOX", 2016, in prep..

[268] S. Schindler: "IES-UIE" pat. appl.: "THE IES USER INTERFACE DESIGN", 2016, in prep..

[269] S. Schindler: "FSTP II" pat. appl.: "THE FSTP II", 2016, in prep..

[270] S. Schindler: "PEGG-Test" pat. appl.: "THE PI GRANTING/GRANTED TEST", 2016, in prep..

[271] S. Schindler: "The Supreme Court's MBA Framework" Implies "Levels Of Abstraction", 12.05.2016?.

[272] S. Schindler: "CSIP" pat. appl.: "CONTEXT SENSITIVE ITEMS PROMPTING", 2016, in prep..

[273] S. Schindler: "MEMO about 'Mathematical Inventive Intelligence, MI'", published on 21.06.2016?.

[275] V. Winters, K. Collins, S. Mehta, van Pelt: "After *Williamson*, Are Functional Claims for SW Viable?", FCBA, 2015?.

[276] K. Collins: "The *Williamson* Revolution in SW Structure", Washington University, Draft 04/01/16.

[277] CAFC Decision in *Williamson v. Citrix Online*, 2015?.

[278] D. Parnas: "Software Fundamentals", ADDISON-WESLEY, 2001.

[279] USSC: Transcript of its Hearing in *Cuozzo* on 25.04.2016?.

[280] M. Lee: Opening Statement at the Patent Quality Community Sympos. USPTO, Alexandria, 27.04.2016

[281] USPTO: "EPQI", <http://www.uspto.gov/patent/initiatives/enhanced-patent-quality-initiative-0>

[282] R. Bahr, USPTO: "Formulating a Subject Matter Eligibility Rejection and Evaluating ...", 04.05.2016?.

[283] S. Schindler: "Prototype Demonstration of the Innovation Expert System", LESI 2016, Peking, 16.05.2016.

[284] B. Wegner: "FSTP – Math. Assess. of an ETCI's Practical/SPL Quality", LESI 2016, Peking, 16.05.2016.

[285] D. Schoenberg: "Presentation of the IES Prototype", LESI 2016, Peking, 16.05.2016.

[286] W. Rautenberg: "Einführung in die Mathematische Logik" VIEWEG/TEUBNER, 2008

[287] ISO/IEC 7498-1:1994; Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – Basic Reference Model; [www.iso.org](http://www.iso.org)

[288] N. Fuchs, K. Kaljurand, T. Kuhn: "Attempto Controlled English for KR", U. Bonn, 2008

[289] CAFC, Decision in *TLI*, 17.05.2016?.

[290] CAFC, Decision in *Enfish*, 12.05.2016?.

[291] S. Schindler: "MEMO – Abstract Ideas in Line with the Supreme Court's MBA Framework", 25.05.2016?.

[292] R. Bahr, USPTO: MEMORANDUM as to "Recent Subject Matter Eligibility Decisions", 19.05.2016?.

[293] S. Schindler: "MRF, the Master Review Form in USPTO's EPQI, SPL, and the IES", publ. 30.05.2016?.

[294] USPTO: "Strategic IT Plan for FY 2015-2018", USPTO's home page

[295] L. Hunger, M. Weather: "The IES GUI – a Tutorial", prep. for publ.

[296] S. Schindler: "A Comment on the 2016 IEG Update – Suggesting More Scrutiny", publ. on 09.06.2016?.

[297] USPTO: "Patent Public Advisory Com., Quarterly Meeting, 11 Update", 05.05.2016, USPTO's home page

[298] S. Schindler, U. Diaz, C. Negrutu, D. Schoenberg, J. Schultze, J. Wang, B. Wegner, R. Wetzler: "The User Interface Design of IES for Testing an ETCI's Its Satisfying SPL – Including Arguing Mode", in prep..

[299] S. Schindler: "On Consolidating the Preemptivity and Enablement Problems", in prep.

[300] S. Schindler: "Epilog to the Patent-Eligibility Problem (Part I)", 20.07.2016?.

[301] S. Schindler: "Epilog to the Basic Patent-Eligibility Problem (Part II)", publ. 19.09.2016?.

[302] S. Schindler: "MEMO – Abstract Ideas and Natural Phenomena as Separate Causes of nPE", in prep.

[303] CAFC, Decision in *Jericho v. Axiomatics*, 14.03.2016?.

[304] CAFC, Decision in *Rapid Litigation Management v. Cellzdirect*, 05.07.2016?.

[305] E. Chatlynne, "The High Court's Artific. And Fictitious Patent Test Part 1", 05.07.2016

[306] CAFC, Decision In re *Alappatt*, 23.07.1994?.

[307] USSC, Decision in *Diamond v. Diehr*, 03.03.1981?.

[308] USSC, Petition for Certiorari: *OP v. Amazon*, 12.11.2015?.

[309] USSC, Petition for Certiorari: *Sequenom v. Ariosa*, 21.03.2016?.

[310] USSC, Petition for Certiorari: *Jericho v. Axiomatics*, 10.06.2016?.

[311] CAFC, Decision in *Bascom v. AT&T*, 27.6.2016?.

[312] R. Bahr, USPTO: MEMO as to "Recent Subject Matter Eligibility Rulings", 14.07.2016?.

[313] a. Wikipedia: "First-order logic".

b. Wikipedia: "Prädikatenlogik".

[314] J. Duffy: "Counterproductive Notice in Literalistic vs. Peripheral Claiming", U. of Virginia, June 2016?.

[315] J. Duffy: "Section 112 and Functional Claiming", FCBA, Nashville, 22.06.2016.

[316] S. Schindler: "MEMO on Metaphysics vs. Rationality in SPL Precedents about ETCIs" alias on "Mathematical Cognition Theory by Far Exceeds Hitherto Knowledge Representation", in prep.

[317] R. Stoll: "Innovation Issues in the Americas – Subject Matter Eligibility" CASRIP, Seattle, 22.07.2016?.

[318] CAFC, Decision in *Phillips v. Zol. Medical*, 28.07.2016?.

[319] CAFC, Decision in *AGIS v. LIFE360*, 28.7.2016

[320] S. Schindler: "Modeling Semantics for the Innovation Description Language, IDL' for ETCIs", this Memo, publ. 20.03.2017?.

[321] S. Schindler: "Epilog to the Basic Patent-Eligibility Problem (Part III)", in prep.

[322] CAFC, Decision in *In re CSB-System International*, 09.08.2016?.

[323] USSC, Decision in *Curcio*, 20.06.2016?.

[324] P. Suppes: "Axiomatic Set Theory", DOVER Publ., Stanford, 1972.

[325] P. Suppes: "Probabilistic Metaphysics", Basil Blackwell, Oxford and New York, 1984

[326] H. Burkhardt, B. Smith: "Handbook of Metaphysics and Ontology", Philosophia Verlag, Munich, 1991.

[327] G. Quinn: "USPTO handling of PI sparks substant. discussion at PPAC meeting", IP Watchdog, 24.08.2016

[328] LAW360: D. Kappos: Modern-Day 101 Cases Spell Trouble For ATMs of The Future, 16.08.2016

[329] M. Holoubek: *ibid*.

[330] S. Schindler: "A PS to my Epilog for the PE-Problem (Part I<sup>000</sup> & II<sup>000</sup>)", publ. 22.09.2016?.

[331] S. Schindler: "MEMO: The Notion of Claiming in SPL – pre and post the Aufklärung", publ. 10.10.2016?.

[332] CAFC, Decision in *Intellectual Ventures v. SYMANTEC*, 30.09.2016?.

[333] S. Schindler: "Two Blueprints for Refining the IEG's Update to Solving the PE Problem or a PS to my Comment on John Duffy's Essay about 'Claiming' under 35 USC", publ. 03.12.2016?.

[334] T. Kuhn: "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions", UCP, 1962.

[335] EU's Biotech Directive

[336] EU's CII Directive

[337] EU's Enforcement Directive

[338] EU's SBC Regulation

[339] S. Schindler: MEMO: The Two § 101 Flaws in the CAFC's IV Decision, caused by the Phenomenon of Paradigm Shift Paralysis" in SPL Precedents about ETCIs", publ. 26.10.2016?.

[340] D. Kappos: "Getting Practical About Patent Quality", *Law360*, 21.10.2016

[341] J. Herndo: "Just When You Thought the CAFC would Softening ... the Tide Turns Again", *PATENTDOCS*?

[342] D. Atkins: "Federal Judges Slam *Alice* at Event Honoring Judge Whyte" *Law360*, 20.10.2016?.

[343] CAFC, Decision in *AMDOCS v. OPENET TELECOM*, 01.11.2016?.

[344] R. Bahr, USPTO: MEMORANDUM as to "Recent Subject Matter Eligibility Decisions", 02.11.2016?.

[345] S. Schindler: "The AMDOCS Dissent Stirs up the Key deficiency of the CAFC's pro-PE *Alice* Decisions, thus showing: The Time is Ripe for Ending the §101 Chaos!", publ. 10.11.2016?.

[346] S. Schindler: "ROUNDTABLE ON PATENT SUBJECT MATTER ELIGIBILITY", publ. 14.11.2016?.

[347] B. Wegner: Invited paper, "Innovation, knowledge representation, knowledge management and classical mathematical thinking", *Cortu*, Ionian University, publ. 22.11.2016?.

[348] B. Wegner: Invited paper, "Math. Modeling of a Robust Claim Interpretation and Claim Construction for an ETCI - Adv. Steps of a 'Mathematical Theory of Innovation'", Bangkok, ICMA-MU, 17.-19.12.2016?.

[349] S. Schindler: "The IES Qualification Machine: Prototype Demonstration", GIPC, New Delhi, 11.-13.01.2017.

[350] B. Wegner: "FSTP – Math. Assess. of ETCIs' Quality", GIPC, New Delhi, 11.-13.01.2017?.

[351] D. Schoenberg: "The IES Prototype Qualification Machine", GIPC, New Delhi, 11.-13.01.2017?.

[352] S. Schindler: "The Lesson to be Learned from the US Patent-Eligibility Hype: It Supports the USPTO's Enhanced Patent Quality Initiative, EPQIMRF", published, on 11.12.2016?.

[353] S. Schindler: "An Amazing SPL Cognition: Any Patent Application is Draftable Totally Robust, Memo A", published on 31.01.2017?.

[354] S. Schindler: "An Amazing SPL Cognition: Any Patent Application is Draftable Totally Robust, Memo B", published by 07.03.2017?.

[355] S. Schindler: "An Amazing SPL Cognition: Any Patent Application is Draftable Totally Robust, Memo C", to be published by the end of 04.2017?.

[356] M. Kikis: "The Supreme Court on Patent Law", *Wolters Kluwer*, 2015.

[357] N. Solomon: "The Disintegration of the American Patent System – Adverse Consequences of Court Decisions", *IPWatchdog*, 26/29.01.2017?.

[358] IPO ("Intellectual Property Owners Association"): "Proposed Amendments to Patent Eligible Subject Matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101", 07.02.2017?.

[359] IA (Internet Association): "Letter to the President-elect Trump", 14.12.2016?.

[360] N. N.: Survey about LifeCycle/Biotechnology, to come soon.

[361] USPTO/PTAB: *Ex parte* Schulhauser, 2016?.

[362] B. Kattehrheinrich et al.: "What Schulhauser Means For Condit. Claim Limitation", *Law360*, 03.02.2017?.

[363] S. Schindler: "The PTAB's Schulhauser decision is Untenable", *reversed*, 08.03.2017?.

[364] R. Katznelson: "Can the Supreme Court's erosion of patent rights be reversed?", *IPWatchdog*, 02.03.2017?.

[365] P. C. & C. Decision in *TVI v. E*, 08.03.2017?.

[366] P. Michel, P. Stone, P. Evans, P. Detkin, D. Matteo, R. Sterne, J. Mar-Spinoia, et al.: "The Current Patent Landscape in the US and Abroad", 12<sup>th</sup> APLI, USPTO, 09.-10.03.2017?.

[367] Transcript of *ibid*, 7? 03.2017?.

[368] P. Newman, dinner speech, 12<sup>th</sup> APLI, USPTO, 09.-10.03.2017?.

[369] S. Schindler: "IDL" pat. appl.: "An Innovation Description Language, IDL' & its IES Interpreter", 2017

[370] 1 Wikipedia: "DSL".

[371] 2 Wikipedia: "Compiler".

3 Wikipedia: "BNF".

[372] S. Schindler: "Innovation Description Languages, IDLs & Knowledge Representations, KR, and Easily Drafting/Testing Patents for Their Total Robustness", publ., 16.05.2017?.

[373] S. Schindler: "Innovation Description Languages, IDLs & Brain Knowledge Representation, brainKR", in prep.

[374] Justice Thomas: Friendly Comment, 04.12.2015?.

[375] J. Koh, P. Tressmer: "Client Alert of 15.05.2017", *Latham & Watkins*?

[376] AIPLA: "Legislative Proposal and Report On Patent Eligible Subject Matter", 12.05.2017?.

[377] IPO: "Proposed Amendments to Patent Eligible Subject Matter", 07.02.2017?.

[378] see the correct reference in the V 27 of the [372] at the below URL, in a few days.

[379] ABA: Letter by D. Suchy to the USPTO, 26.03.2017?.

[380] SPO: Message by H-M Tso, J. Yi, 31.03.2017?.

[381] K. Canady: "Take a Walk on the Bio Side: Patent-Eligibility of Biotechnological Inventions", *AIPLA*, 17.05.2017?.

[382] S. Alter: "Nuts & Bolts Of 1010", *AIPLA*, 17.05.2017?.

[383] B. Stoll: "11 in the Future", *AIPLA*, 17.05.2017?.

[384] G. Wisdom: "Bus. Analysis Based on *Alice* (Conceded to be Totally Abstract)", *Microsoft*, *AIPLA*, 17.05.2017?.

[385] EFF: "Comments Regarding ... Subject Matter Eligibility", 18.01.2017?.

[386] *ibid*.

[387] J. Duffy, C. Bays, T. Sichelmann: "The Future of Patent Venue", *AIPLA 2017 Spring Conference*, 18.05.2017?.

[388] USSC, Decision in *Heartland v. Kraft*, 22.05.2017?.

[389] AIPLA: "Patent Venue Statute is not Modified by General Venue Statute", 22.05.2017?.

[390] S. Schindler: "The Recent AIPLA Meeting s . . . Nationwide §101-Guidelines ...", publ., 14.06.2017?.

[391] S. Schindler: "Automating and Semi-Automating ETCIs' SPL-Satisf.-Tests", this paper?

[392] S. Schindler: "The FSTP-Test and the *DDR*'s ETCI Reconsidered – as Model Case", in prep.

[393] M. Miron: "CCJ S. Prost, CJ S. Plager, CJ J. Reyna, CJ T. Hughes, CJ K. Stoll", 2017 FCBA, 21.06.2017?.

[394] S. Schindler: "Innovation Desc. Languages & Knowledge Rep.s", *IRRP17*, Orlando, 08.-11.07.2017?.

[395] S. Schindler: "Innovation Desc. Languages & Knowledge Rep.s", *KE17*, Las Vegas, 17.-20.2017?.

[396] S. Schindler: "Innovation Desc. Languages & Knowledge Rep.s", *China*.

[397] CAFC, Decision in *ARIOSA v. SEQUENOM*, 12.06.2015?.

[398] CAFC, Decision in *Sequenom v. Ariosa*, 21.03.2016?.

[399] USSC, *PTC* in *ARIOSA v. SEQUENOM*, 21.03.2016?., DENIED on 27.06.2016?.

[400] S. Schindler: "SEQUENOM – The CAFC's Incomplete Interpretation of §101/*Alice*", to be publ. on 11.07.2017

[401] S. Schindler: "Axiomatic Mathematization of an ETCI's Exceptional Inventive Concepts", to be published.