



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
11/181,146	07/14/2005	John Yen	PST-14902/36	7426
25006	7590	02/01/2013	EXAMINER	
GIFFORD, KRASS, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C			BAHL, SANGEETA	
PO BOX 7021			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TROY, MI 48007-7021			3629	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/01/2013	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

doCKET@patlaw.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte JOHN YEN, XIAOCONG FAN, SHUANG SUN,
and MICHAEL MCNEESE

Appeal 2011-010246
Application 11/181,146
Technology Center 3600

Before MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, JOSEPH A. FISCHETTI, and BIBHU
R. MOHANTY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

CRAWFORD, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants seek our review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 of the Examiner's final decision rejecting claims 2 to 7, 9 to 17, 19, and 22. We have jurisdiction over the appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b). Appellants appeared for oral hearing on January, 16, 2013.

We REVERSE.

Claim 22 is illustrative:

22. An improved decision-malting process, comprising the steps of:

providing a collaborative, team-oriented computer architecture wherein human and software agents interact through a shared mental model including an experience knowledge base;

receiving information regarding a current situation to be analyzed;

consulting the experience knowledge base to qualify the received information based upon any similarities to the current situation;

presenting the qualified information to a user through one of the agents;

interacting with the user to receive assistance in the form of assumptions or expectancies about the situation;

providing the refined information and assumptions or expectancies to other agents;

utilizing cues in the experience knowledge base to contact one or more external information sources to gather missing, relevant information, if any, in support of the assumptions or expectancies;

using the missing, relevant information in conjunction with other collected information to determine whether a decision about the situation is evolving in an anticipated direction; and, if so:

informing the user and updating the experience knowledge base to enhance the quality or timeliness of future decisions regarding similar situations.

Claims 22, 2 to 7, 9 to 13, and 15 to 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over John A. Sokolowski, *MODELING THE DECISION PROCESS OF A JOINT TASK FORCE COMMANDER*, 1-127 (May 2003) (hereinafter “Sokolowski”), Major John D. Hall, *Decision Making in the Information Age*, Field Artillery, 28-32 (Sep./Oct. 2000) (hereinafter “Hall”), Sullivan (US 6,999,990 B1, iss. Feb. 14, 2006), and Bonissone (US 6,643,799 B1, iss. Nov. 4, 2003).

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sokolowski, Hall, Sullivan, Bonissone, and Robert J. Sternberg, *Environmental effects on Cognitive Abilities*, 228-31 (2001) (hereinafter “Sternberg”).

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sokolowski.

ANALYSIS

The Appellants argue that Sokolowski does not disclose “utilizing cues in the experience knowledge base to contact one or more external information sources.” We agree. The Examiner has directed our attention to page 65 of Sokolowski lines 25 to 27 for disclosure of this subject matter.

We find that Sokolowski discloses at page 65 that when the Recognition Agent receives a decision request, it performs a lookup of the decision type in the experience database. If a match is found, the Recognition Agent reads into the computer memory the experience data associated with the decision. It is here that the frame data structure is populated with the basic cues, goals, and actions related to the decision.

Appeal 2011-010246
Application 11/181,146

This portion of Sokolowski does not relate to external information sources as the Recognition Agent and the experience database are within the Recognition-Primed Decision Agent itself (Figure 13). As such, this portion of Sokolowski does not disclose utilizing cues to contact one or more external information sources to gather missing relevant information as required by claim 22.

In view of the foregoing, we will not sustain the Examiner's rejection of claim 22 and claims 2 to 7, 9 to 17, and 19 dependent thereon.

DECISION

We REVERSE the decision of the Examiner.

REVERSED

hh