



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

Table with 5 columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO.
Row 1: 14/871,695, 09/30/2015, Kenneth W. Dietrich, H0048932-0115, 4386
Row 2: 92720, 7590, 02/01/2019, HONEYWELL/MUNCK, Patent Services, 115 Tabor Road, P.O. Box 377, MORRIS PLAINS, NJ 07950
Row 3: EXAMINER ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH
Row 4: ART UNIT 3649, PAPER NUMBER
Row 5: NOTIFICATION DATE 02/01/2019, DELIVERY MODE 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):

patentservices-us@honeywell.com
patents@munckwilson.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte KENNETH W. DIETRICH, GANESH P. GADHE,
ERIC T. BOICE, and SETH G. CARPENTER¹

Appeal 2018-005813
Application 14/871,695
Technology Center 3600

Before JASON V. MORGAN, JAMES B. ARPIN, and ADAM J. PYONIN,
Administrative Patent Judges.

MORGAN, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION ON APPEAL
STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Introduction

This is an appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's Final Rejection of claims 1–20, which constitute all of the claims pending in this application. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We AFFIRM.

¹ Appellant is the applicant and real party in interest, Honeywell International Inc. Appeal Br. 2.

Invention

The Specification discloses analyzing characteristics of and events associated with multiple devices to generate a cyber-security risk assessment for display. Abstract.

Representative Claim (key limitations emphasized)

1. A method comprising:
 - receiving information identifying characteristics of multiple devices in a computing system and multiple events associated with the multiple devices;
 - analyzing the information using multiple sets of rules;
 - aggregating risk items defined by the information;*
 - generating at least one risk assessment value based on the analyzing, the at least one risk assessment value identifying at least one cyber-security risk of the multiple devices; and
 - displaying, in a user interface, the at least one risk assessment value and a zone aggregate record that identifies a highest risk item among the aggregated risk items for devices within a zone.*

Rejection

The Examiner rejects claims 1–20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over the combined teachings of Kumar et al. (US 2013/0298244 A1; published Nov. 7, 2013) (“Kumar”) and Singla et al. (US 2016/0212165 A1; published July 21, 2016) (“Singla”). Final Act. 8–52.

ANALYSIS

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner finds that Singla’s presentation of a threat score of an entity representing a group, zone, location, or category teaches or suggests the steps of “*aggregating risk items defined by the information*” and “*displaying a zone aggregate record that identifies a*

highest risk item among the aggregated risk items for devices within a zone.”
Final Act. 33–34 (¶¶ 21, 24, 40, 42, Fig. 6).

Appellant contends the Examiner erred because “*Singla* merely describes that its threat scores are calculated based on executing queries on security event and model information” and that there “is no disclosure or suggestion of any zone aggregate record that identifies a *highest risk item among aggregated risk items for devices within a zone* as claimed.” Appeal Br. 10 (citing *Singla* ¶¶ 11, 19). Appellant argues “[n]othing in *Singla* supports the Examiner’s assertion that[:] (i) an entity represents an aggregation of devices within a group or zone and (ii) a threat score for the entity identifies a *highest risk item among aggregated risk items for devices within the group or zone.*” Appeal Br. 10.

Appellant’s arguments are unpersuasive because *Singla* specifically discloses a *hierarchy* of threat entities; thus, higher-level entities represent an aggregation of lower-level entities (e.g., devices) organized as a group or zone. *See, e.g.*, *Singla* ¶ 21; Final Act. 33. *Singla* not only teaches using formulas to calculate a final threat score of an entity, *Singla* discloses that “the threat score may be the . . . *maximum* of another one of the threat scores.” *Singla* ¶ 35 (emphasis added). That is, *Singla* suggests calculating a higher-level entity’s threat score as a function of the maximum threat score of lower-level entities. *Singla* further discloses that “[t]he user will be able to drill down the dashboard to reach *the scoring mechanism* for each threat score.” *Id.* ¶ 55 (emphasis added). Thus, *Singla* suggests not only displaying a threat score of a higher-level entity, but also displaying the lower-level entity that, by having the highest threat score among the lower-

level entities, served as the scoring mechanism for the higher-level entity's threat score. *See* Ans. 3–4.

For these reasons, we agree with the Examiner that Kumar and Singla teach or suggest “aggregating risk items defined by the information” and “displaying . . . a zone aggregate record that identifies a highest risk item among the aggregated risk items for devices within a zone,” as recited in claim 1. *See* Final Act. 33–34.

Accordingly, we sustain the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claim 1, and claims 2–6, 8–13, and 15–20, which Appellant does not argue separately.

Appellant further argues the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 7 and 14 based on the teachings of Kumar. Appeal Br. 10–12. Appellant's arguments in the Appeal Brief do not, however, address the Examiner's findings showing that Singla teaches or suggests those disputed recitations. *See* Final Act. 51 (citing Singla ¶¶ 11, 18–24, 31, 32, 34–36, 40–42, 44, 45, 53, and 55); Ans. 4. Appellant's arguments in the Reply with respect to Singla are untimely and are not considered. 37 C.F.R. § 41.41(b)(2) (2017). Therefore, we also sustain the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections of claims 7 and 14.

DECISION

We affirm the Examiner's decision rejecting claims 1–20.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(f).

AFFIRMED