REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-23 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 15, 16, 22 and 23 have been amended. Applicants submit that support for these amendments can be found throughout the originally-filed Application and at least at paragraphs [0035] and [0053].

Unless otherwise specified in the below discussion, Applicants have amended the above-referenced claims in order to provide clarity or to correct informalities in the claims. Applicants further submit that, unless discussed below, these amendments are not intended to narrow the scope of the claims. Applicants have also canceled a claim in order to clarify the issues for prosecution. By these amendments and cancellation, Applicants do not concede that the cited art is prior to any invention now or previously claimed. Applicants further reserve the right to pursue the original versions of the claims in the future, for example, in a continuing application.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0278702 naming Koyfman et al. as inventors ("Koyfman"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent Claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 have been rejected using substantially the same reasoning. Without conceding to the validity of treating each of the independent claims in this manner, Applicants respond to the rejections using the limitations of

- 10 -

independent Claim 1 as an example. Applicants submit that the following discussion applies to the rejections directed toward all the independent claims.

As amended, independent Claim 1 includes a limitation clarifying the nature of a parent goal: "traversal of the first parent goal results in executing an action associated with the first parent goal and subsequently selecting a child goal of the first parent goal for evaluation." Applicants respectfully submit that the cited sections of Koyfman fail to provide disclosure of such a "goal."

As purported disclosure of the limitations of previous Claim 1, the Office Action cites to sections of Koyfman related to Koyfman Figure 2. The Office Action specifically relates Koyfman's "states" to the claimed "goals." *See, e.g.*, Office Action, p.2; *see also* Advisory Action, p.2. Koyfman's "states" are merely a static intermediate stage between transitions. *See, e.g.*, Koyfman, ¶ [0051]. Koyfman provides no disclosure that "states" can or do provide an associated action. Further, Koyfman provides no disclosure of actually executing such an action when traversing a state. Indeed, the only actions disclosed by Koyfman appear to be associated with transitions and not the "states."

In addition, Koyfman provides no disclosure that traversal of a "state" results in selecting a child goal for evaluation. There is merely transition from Koyfman's "state 42" to "state 44." Koyfman provides no disclosure of actually selecting a child goal for evaluation because Koyfman's transition is determined by a "precondition." If the precondition is met, then a particular path is followed. Koyfman does provide for any selection of such transition.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Koyfman fails to provide disclosure of the claimed "goals."

- 11 -

Claim 1, as amended, further contains a limitation clarifying the nature of the nature of the claimed "assuming of a first definition of a slot or method": "said assuming the first definition of the slot or method comprises searching the first path upstream to the first parent goal for the first definition of the slot or method." Applicants respectfully submit that the cited sections of Koyfman fail to provide such a search for a definition of a slot or method.

The Office Action posits that "Koyfman teaches that depending upon which edge is transitioned a corresponding function is inherited from the upstream state." *See* Office Action, p.4. The Office Action further suggests that "Koyfman's attributes, edges, and addresses are each functions set by the upstream state." *Id.* Even assuming that this proposition by the Office Action is accurate (a proposition with which Applicants do not necessarily agree), Applicants submit that there is no disclosure of searching upstream for slot and method definitions, as provided by the amended claims. In fact, the Office Action itself admits that merely transitioning down a particular edge defines the cited equivalents to the claimed slots and methods. Thus, there is no concept of the searching provided by the amended claims. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the cited sections of Koyfman fail to provide disclosure of the amended limitation.

Further, the cited sections provide no mechanism for passing a slot value or a method from a parent goal to a child goal, as claimed. The cited sections of Koyfman fail to describe Koyfman's nodes in terms of a hierarchy as claimed. Instead, they are described as a "directed acyclic graph (DAG), in which nodes represent possible intermediate stages, and directed edges represent the possible transformations that occur between the stages." Koyfman, ¶ [0051]. There is no parent-child relationship provided for Koyfman's "directed acyclic graph." Koyfman further provides that "[a] stage may

have several possible outgoing edges, each associated with a different traversal condition. Each node and edge has a list of attributes, to which the transformations and the traversal conditions relate." *Id.* But there is no disclosure of any passing of slot definitions or methods from a first to a second node or from a parent to a child goal. The attributes and the transformations appear to be related solely to the node itself and the traversed edge. Koyfman does not provide for assuming of a slot definition or a method by the second node, as claimed.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the cited sections of Koyfman fail to provide disclosure of all the limitations of independent Claims 1, 8, 15 and 22, as amended, and all claims depending therefrom. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5090.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to Deposit Account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan N. Geld/

Jonathan N. Geld
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,702
(512) 439-5090 [Phone]
(512) 439-5099 [Fax]

Application No.: 11/853,501