

The following small statement is a response to the pending NPRM, Docket # PTO–P2018–0036.

Dropping the BRI-Standard is Necessary! ¹⁾

But can the *Phillips*-Standard Meet the Supreme Court's Framework Requirements?

Sigram Schindler
TU Berlin & TELES Patent Rights International GmbH
www.fstp-expert-system.com

The answer is: NOT REALLY,

The problem being that the proposed new claim construction standard (based on the CAFC's *Phillips* decision, 2005) does not yet know the Supreme Court's framework decisions²⁾. I.e., especially *Mayo/Biosig/Alice*³⁾ require to search – in construing a 'claim interpretation's, CI's' claim construction⁴⁾ for (with it) thereafter testing the CI, whether it satisfies SPL³⁾ – this CI's specification for an inventive alias exceptional concept (modeling an abstract idea or a natural phenomenon) that is independent of this CI's other concepts. But the *Phillips* based claim interpretation does not yet know any one of these few notional refinements of SPL by the Supreme Court's framework clearly defined and required to be used for this CI test!

Thus, starting the CI's PE-analysis from the *Phillips*-based claim interpretation – due to the preceding reasoning today seen as incomplete, after the Supreme Court's reinterpretation of § 101 for refining SPL in favor of ETCIs (see *Mayo/Biosig/Alice*) – drags also *Alice*'s PE-analysis into incomplete interpretation. This is indeed the USPTO's and CAFC's key fault^[480] stereotypically committed when dealing with ETCIs, primarily DNA-based ones (explained in more detail several times already in FSTP-papers, once more in^[480]).

... .. but the flaw is SIMPLY FIXABLE, EVEN IF NOT EVIDENTLY:⁵⁾

IN TOTAL: In line with the Supreme Court's responsibility by the US Constitution for interpreting the 35 USC §§ 101, 102, 103, 112 and with Andrei Iancu's multiple explicitly concurring statements, this author suggests to replace in this NPRM the targeted claim interpretation/construction⁴⁾ standard based on the CAFC's *Phillips* decision by the corresponding notions based on the Supreme Court's framework decisions.

Without using the Supreme Court's framework based SPL refinement it is impossible to guarantee consistency and predictability in SPL precedents alias absolute robustness of granted US patents – as by investors and inventors into patent business urgently needed – while using it properly does guarantee these advantages.

¹ This author has explained in far more than 20 (FSTP-) publications – US-wide and by scientific (especially AI^{[2](470, fn1.b))}) reasoning – that the meaning of the notion 'broadest reasonable interpretation, BRI' is indefinable, as being highly metaphysical^{[470, fn5.b))}.

² (while being a big step into the correct direction, it is not big enough for enabling SPL to dealing with 'emerging technology, ET' CIs)

³ Meeting by a 'claimed invention, CI' the requirements stated/implied by the framework^[480] is necessary and sufficient for the CI satisfying SPL. *Mayo* (2012) and *Alice* (2014) require identifying in a CI's specification an 'inventive concept' resp. an 'inventive *Alice* concept' for modeling an abstract idea or a natural phenomenon^[480], and *Biosig* (2013) requires that the meaning of a CI is clearly defined, whereby residual ambiguities must be resolved by the CI's inventor, see^[480].

⁴ For the distinctions between the notions 'claim construction' & 'claim interpretation', between 'inventive alias exceptional concepts' & 'ordinary (creative or noncreative) concepts', and between 'dependent concepts' & 'independent concepts' see^[480].

⁵ by simply grasping the SPL-notions' proper meanings, the precise definitions of which the Supreme Court by its framework's requirements either clarified or partially even delivered for the first time, see^[480].

The FSTP-Project's Reference List (Version of 05.07.2018)

Most of the FSTP-Project papers below are written in preparation of the textbook^[182] – i.e. are not fully self-explanatory independent of their predecessors.
WARNING: Some of the final entries in the FSTP-Project's Reference List are here slightly incorrect – the author is begging your pardon for any inconvenience!

- [2] AIT: "Advanced Information Sciences & Technologies" or "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 & MKR: "Mathematical Artificial Intelligence & Mathematical Knowledge Representation", the resilient fundament of AIT and "Facts Screening/Transforming/Presenting, FSTP"-Technology, both developed here. — currently most of it still in a "status nascendi"^[184]
- [5] S. Schindler: "Math. Modeling SPL Top-Down vs. Bottom-Up", Yokohama, 2012¹
- [9] a. S. Schindler, "Patent Business – Before Shake-up", 2013¹.
b. S. Schindler, "Patent Business – Before Shake-up", 2015¹.
c. S. Schindler, "Patent Business – Before Shake-up", 2018, to be publ. in July 2018.
- [64] B. Wegner, S. Schindler: "A Mathe. Structure Modeling Inventions", Coimbra, CICM-2014¹.
- [69] USSC, Transcript of the oral argument in *Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank*, 31.03.2014¹.
- [91] B. Wegner, S. Schindler: "A Math. KR Mod. for Claim Inter. & Con.", in prep.
- [113] S. Schindler: "The CAFC's Rebellion is Over – The USSC, by *MayaBiosig/Alice*, ...", publ. 07.08.2014¹.
- [130] G. Frege: "Funktion und Begriff", 1891.
- [157] USPTO: "2014 Int. Guidance on Pat. Subj. M. Eli. & Examples: Abs. Ideas"¹.
- [160] S. Schindler: "The USSC *Maya/Myriad/Alice* Decisions. The PTO's Implementation by Its IEG, The CAFC's *DDR* & *Myriad* Recent Decisions", publ. 14.01.2015¹, its short version¹, and its PP presentation at USPTO, 21.01.2015¹.
- [182] S. Schindler: "Innovation Theory and Mathematical AI Based Patent Technology", Textbook, in prep.
- [218] B. Russel: "Principles of Mathematics", see also Wikipedia.
- [278] a.) D. Parnas: Personal Communications, Berlin, 1975.
b.) D. Parnas: "Software Fundamentals", ADDISON-WESLEY, 2001.
- [296] S. Schindler: "A Com. on the 2016 IEG Update – Suggesting More Scrutiny", publ. on 09.06.2016¹.
- [313] a.) Wikipedia: "First-order logic", b.) Wikipedia: "Prädikatenlogik", c.) Wikipedia: "Analytic Philosophy", d.) Wikipedia: "D. Parnas".
- [314] J. Duffy: "Counterproductive Notice in Literalistic v. Peripheral Claiming", U. of Virginia, June 2016¹.
- [332] S. Schindler: "The Notion of Claiming in SPL – pre&post Aufklärung", p. 10.10.2016¹
- [335] T. Kuhn: "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions", UCP, 1962, see also Wikipedia
- [348] B. Wegner: Invited paper, "Innovation, knowledge representation, knowledge management and paper, "Math. Modeling class. math. thinking", Corfu, Ionian University, 22.11.2016¹
- [349] B. Wegner: Invited paper, "Robust Claim Interpretation and Claim Construction for an ETCI. - Steps of a "Mathematical Theory of Innovation", Bangkok, ICMA-MU, 17.-19.12.2016¹
- [350] S. Schindler: "The IES Qual. Machine: Prototype Demo", GIPC, New Delhi, 11.-13.01.2017.
- [351] B. Wegner: "FSTP – Math. Assess. of ETCI's Quality", GIPC, New Delhi, 11.-13.01.2017¹.
- [352] D. Schoenberg: "The IES Prototype Qualif. Machine", GIPC, New Delhi, 11.-13.01.2017¹.
- [353] S. Schindler: "The Lesson to be Learned from the US PE Hype", publ. 11.12.2016¹.
- [354] S. Schindler: "An Amazing SPL Cogn.: Any Pat. Appl. is Draft. Tot. Rob.", publ. 31.01.2017¹.
- [355] S. Schindler: "An Ama. SPL Cogn.: Any Pat. Appl. is Draft. Tot. Rob.", publ. 07.03.2017¹.
- [361] J. Straus: "IPRss and Bioeconomy", Journal of IP Law&Practice, 14.07.2017
- [362] USPTO/PTAB: *Ex parte* Schulhauser, 2016,¹
- [364] S. Schindler: "The PTAB's Schulhauser Dec. is Untenable", publ. 08.03.2017¹
- [367] P. Michel: "The Current Patent Landscape in the US&Abroad", USPTO, 09.-10.03.2017¹.
- [371] Wikipedia: a.) "DSL", b.) "Compiler", c.) "BNF", d.) "Analytic Philosophy", e.) "Axiomatization", f.) "Memory", g.) "Pron.",
- [372] S. Schindler: "IDLs & KR's, and Easily Drafting&Testing Patents for Their Total Robustness", publ., 16.05.2017¹
- [374] Justice Thomas: Friendly Comment, 04.12.2015¹
- [383] B. Stoll: "101 in the Future", AIPLA, 17.05.2017¹
- [388] USSC, Decision in *Heartland v. Kraft*, 22.05.2017¹.
- [390] S. Schindler: "The Recent AIPLA Meeting's ... §101-Guidelines ...", publ., 14.06.2017¹
- [391] S. Schindler: "ANNEX⁽³⁹¹⁾ to⁽³⁹¹⁾ – Trivializing & Semi-Automat. ETCI's SPL-Satisf.-Tests¹
- [394] S. Schindler: "IDL & Knowledge Rep.s", IRRP'17, Orlando, 08.-11.07.2017.
- [395] S. Schindler: "IDL & Knowledge Rep.s", IKE'17, Las Vegas, 17.-20.09.2017.
- [396] S. Schindler: "IDL & KR's", GCKE-2017, Qingdao, 19.-21.09.2017.
- [397] CAFC, Decision in *ARIOSA v. SEQUENOM*, 12.06.2015¹.
- [400] S. Schindler: "MEMO: Sequenom – An Incomplete Interp. of §101/Alice by the CAFC, Sequenom's PFC Misses the Point, USSC's Den. Con.", 17.07.2017¹
- [406] S. Schindler: "The PE-Theorem, FSTP-Test, and the US Innovation Econo. ...", publ. 01.08.2017¹
- [407] USPTO: "PATENTELIG. SUBJECT MATTER: REPORT ...", 25.07.2017¹
- [410] ~~td:~~
- [414] L. Fischer: "S.M Eligibility", BCBCP Partnership Meeting, 02.08.2017¹
- [415] S. Schindler: "The USPTO's §101/BioTech WS: Its PE-Test is Too Vague ...", 12.09.2017¹
- [420] CAFC, Decision in *Visual Memory*, 15.08.2017¹
- [421] CAFC, Decision in *Shannon* "A Mathematical Theory of Communication", 1948.
- [422] S. Schindler: "The CAFC's BioTech PE-Deisions – Reconsidered for the R&D-Investor Community", publ. 15.10.2017¹
- [424] P. Michel: Comment on the BRI and Consistency, at recent Congressional hearing¹.
- [425] N. Kelly, USPTO, 25.09.2015¹
- [426] L. Fischer: "IP & Diagnostic Symposium", Alexandria, 29.09.2017¹
- [427] H. Sauer: "IP & Diagnostic Symposium", Alexandria, 29.09.2017¹
- [428] W. Woessner: "IP & Diagnostic Symposium", Alexandria, 29.09.2017¹
- [430] E. Haug: "FCBA Global Series – Euro. 2017 Session", London, 25.-26.09.2017¹
- [432] Judge R. Taranto, Judge A. Lourie, Chief Judge S. Prost, Judge J. Reyna: "Discussion with the Judiciary", FCBA Bench & Bar in Dialogue, New York, 4.10.2017¹
- [433] S. Schindler: "An SPL's ETCI is Dig. iff it is Totally Rob.—Espec. *PE. O/States*", publ. 05.10.2017¹
- [434] S. Schindler: "Getting Famil. with the IES by Testing its Prototype .V.x, x>1", in prep.
- [435] P. Leahy, IPAS 2017, Intellectual Property Awareness Summit, 06.11.2017, Chicago
P. Ludwig, AIPPI 2017, Sydney.
- [438] USSC, Brief of Federal Respondent (USPTO) in *Oil States Energy v. Greene's Energy*¹
- [439] R. Rader: Pers. Communication, Chicago, 06.11.2017.
- [440] S. Schindler: "The Supreme Court's Outer Shell-Specification of an ETCI – Digitizing & Mathematizing It. & The Semi-Automatic FSTP-Tests by the IES of ETCI's for Satisfying SPL– *DDR*, *Myriad*, *Sequenom*, *GTG* & The German SPL-Precedents Implies the Supreme Court's SPL-Framework – Political Issues.", publ. 20.01.2018¹
- [441] S. Schindler: "O/AEM—An ETCI's 4 Use-Hierarchy-Levels", in prep.
- [442] P. Michel: Pers. Communication, Alexandria, 30.08.2017.
- [443] D. Schoenberg, J. Schulze, J. Wang, C. Negrutiu, B. Wegner, R. Wetzler, S. Schindler, "The User Interface Design of the IES for Testing an ETCI's Satisfying SPL", 23.01.2018¹
- [444] D. Schoenberg, J. Schulze, J. Wang, C. Negrutiu, B. Wegner, R. Wetzler, S. Schindler, "The IES GUI – A Primer: Using the FSTP-Test, Inhouse Mode", 23.01.2018¹
- [445] B. Wegner: "A Mathematical KR Model for Claim Interpretation and Construction", 23.01.2018¹
- [446] R. Stoll (on IP Watchdog): „Director Andrei Iancu's Act One“, 26.11.2017
- [448] H. Goddard, J. Strauss: Pers. Communication, Berlin, 20.12.2017.
- [450] E. Kandel: "Auf der Suche nach dem Gedächtnis.", Random House, 2006.
- [451] S. El-Metwally, O. Ouda, M. Helmy: "Next Generation Sequencing Technologies and Challenges in Sequence Assembly", Springer, 2014
- [452] CAFC, Decision in *Finjan v. Blue Coat Systems*, 10.01.2018¹.
- [453] S. Schindler: "AI and US& German SPL will Boost R&D-Investments", publ. 19.04.2018¹
- [454] CAFC, Decision in *EXERGEN*, 08.03.2018¹
- [455] MPEP-2018, 25.01.2018
- [456] S. Schindler: "Short AI Comment on MPEP2018_SECT2106 – NO IMPROVEMENT.", publ. 26.02.2018¹.
- [457] B. Wegner, S. Schindler, et al.: "Mathematizing Any Rationalized ETCI", in prep.
- [458] S. Schindler: "Comment on the Absurdity of §101 in MPEP-2018_Sect2106.", 16.03.2018¹.
- [459] S. Schindler: "Andrei Iancu's Promises of More Certainty in USPTO's PE- Decisions – Hope- or Harmful?", publ. 03.05.2018¹
- [460] USSC, Decision in *Oil States*, 24.04.2018¹
- [461] USSC, Decision in *SAS INSTITUTE*, 24.04.2018¹
- [465] J. Matal: Opening Keynote, BIO's IPCC 2018, New Orleans, 11.04.2018.
- [466] A. Iancu: "Role of US Patent Policy in Domestic Innovation and Potential Impacts on Investment", AmCham, 11.04.2018¹.
- [467] CAFC, Decision in *VANDA*, 13.04.2018¹
- [468] S. Schindler: "Andrei Iancu's Further Pub. Discuss. about USPTO's Serv.", publ. 11.05.2018¹
- [469] USPTO's NPRM concerning the BRI.¹
- [470] S. Schindler: "USPTO's Berkheimer PE-Guideline Talks the US Patent Community onto a Wrong Track and A Question – not asked – as to USPTO's DataBase-Searching for Patent-(Application)s", this—communication—, publ.—10.06.2018; REMAKE publ.06.07.2018¹
- [471] A. Iancu: at the USPTO/APPC meeting in Alexandria, 03.05.2018
- [472] J. Manno, K. Parendo: "Demonstration: USPTO Search Tools", USPTO, 03.05.2018¹.
- [473] A. Iancu: at the AIPLA meeting in Seattle, 15-17.05.2018.
- [474] R. Bahr, USPTO, MEMORANDUM (as to Berkheimer), 19.04.2018¹
- [475] B. Goodlatte, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee: "Goodlatte Statement at USPTO Oversight Hearing", 22.05.2018¹
- [476] A. Iancu: "Oversight of the USPTO", before the Committee on the Judiciary, US House of Representatives", 22.05.2018¹
- [477] S. Schindler: "Rationality Returns in the US SPL-Drama – it now has a White Knight", 21.06.2018¹
- [478] A. Iancu: "Remarks delivered at the AEI", 21.06.2018¹
- [479] S. Schindler: "Summary of the FSTP-View at the BRI", publ.09.07.2018.
- [480] S. Schindler: "Summary of the §101/PE-View at the BRI", to be publ.19.07.2018.

*) documents and full list available at www.fstp-expert-system.com.

Yet note the above WARNING: Some of the final entries in the FSTP-Project Reference List likely have wrong numbers!!!