UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
17/082,632	10/28/2020	Giuseppe Iacobelli	30244-007001	1690

167376   7590   04/13/2021
OCCHIUTI & ROHLICEK LLP
50 Congress Street
Suite 1000
Boston, MA 02109

EXAMINER
HANG, VU B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/13/2021	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):

INFO@ORPATENT.COM

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

Office Action Summary	Application No. 17/082,632	Applicant(s) Iacobelli, Giuseppe		
	Examiner VU B HANG	Art Unit 2672	AIA (FITF) Status Yes	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☑ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03/24/2021.
   ☐ A declaration(s)/affidavit(s) under **37 CFR 1.130(b)** was/were filed on _____.
2a)☑ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
4)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims*

5) ☑ Claim(s) _1-19_ is/are pending in the application.
   5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
6) ☑ Claim(s) _7-10_ is/are allowed.
7) ☑ Claim(s) _1-6 and 11-19_ is/are rejected.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
9) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement

* If any claims have been determined <u>allowable</u>, you may be eligible to benefit from the **Patent Prosecution Highway** program at a participating intellectual property office for the corresponding application. For more information, please see http://www.uspto.gov/patents/init_events/pph/index.jsp or send an inquiry to **PPHfeedback@uspto.gov.**

Application Papers

10)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
11)☑ The drawing(s) filed on 10/28/2020 is/are: a)☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   Certified copies:
      a)☐ All   b)☐ Some**   c)☐ None of the:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

** See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08a and/or PTO/SB/08b)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

3) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Other: _____.

Notice of Pre-AIA or AIA Status

- The present application, filed on or after March 16, 2013, is being examined under the

  first inventor to file provisions of the AIA.

- This office action is responsive to the amendment filed on 03/24/2021.

- Claims 1-19 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed, with respect to the amended Claims 7 and 10, have been fully

considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 USC 103 have been

withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed, with respect to the amended Claims 11 and 19, have been fully

considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the cited prior art, Talwar et al. (US

Pub. 2019/0311713 A1) and Choi et al. (US Pub. 2016/0336024 A1), fail to teach "a method for

managing interactions between users of an interface and a plurality of voice assistants" including

"monitoring an interaction between the voice assistant and the user during servicing of the command."

In response, the examiner points out that Talwar teaches a method for managing interactions

between users of an interface and a plurality of voice assistants (see Fig.1 (170,174), Fig.2 (210),

paragraphs [0014-0017] and paragraph [0044]). The interface is the front end voice assistant including

the NPL engine for processing the user utterance and selecting at least one persona assistants for

servicing.

Choi teaches an interface including a dialog manager module and an NPL engine for monitoring

user interaction during processing of a user speech request or command (see Fig.4 (S435,S437,S438),

Fig.6 (10,640) and paragraphs [0138-0140]). The interface is tracking the context of the conversation

between the user and the dialog system during the processing of a user request. The context state and

domain may change during the conversation between the user and dialog system.

It would have been obvious, before the effect filing date of the application, to include to

Talwar's method the step for "monitoring an interaction between the voice assistant and the user

during servicing of the command". The motivation would be to track the context or intent of the user

during the processing of the user's request to ensure that an intended task is completed. The user

request may need clarifications through a Q and A session before the execution of the requested task.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections

set forth in this Office action:

> A patent for a claimed invention may not be obtained, notwithstanding that the claimed invention is
> not identically disclosed as set forth in section 102, if the differences between the claimed invention
> and the prior art are such that the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious before the
> effective filing date of the claimed invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the
> claimed invention pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention
> was made.

Claims 1, 6, 11-18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Talwar et

al. (US Pub. 2019/0311713 A1) and Choi et al. (US Pub. 2016/0336024 A1).

Regarding **Claims 11 and 19,** Talwar teaches a method for managing interactions between users

of an interface and a plurality of voice assistants associated with the interface (see Fig.1 (170,173,174),

Fig.2 (210), paragraphs [0014-0017] and paragraph [0044]), the method comprising:

receiving a voice command from a user of the interface (see Fig.3 (310) and paragraphs [0029-

0030]);

determining a voice assistant of the plurality of voice assistants for servicing the command (see

Fig.1 (174), Fig.3 (370) and paragraph [0030]);

and providing a representation of the voice command to the voice assistant for servicing (see

Fig.1 (174), Fig.3 (370), paragraph [0030] and paragraphs[0069-0070]).

Talwar fails to teach monitoring an interaction between the voice assistant and the user during

servicing of the command.

Choi, however, teaches an interface including a dialog manager module and an NPL engine for

monitoring user interaction during processing of a user speech request or command (see Fig.4

(S435,S437,S438), Fig.6 (10,640) and paragraphs [0138-0140]).

It would have been obvious, before the effect filing date of the application, to include to

Talwar's method the step for "monitoring an interaction between the voice assistant and the user

during servicing of the command". The motivation would be to track the context or intent of the user

during the processing of the user's request to ensure that an intended task is completed.

Regarding **Claim 18**, Talwar further teaches wherein at least one of the voice assistants is

associated with a smart phone or a smart speaker (see paragraph [0022] and paragraph [0024]).

Regarding **Claim 17**, Talwar further teaches wherein the interface is an in-vehicle interface (see

Fig.1 (102,130), paragraph [0019] and paragraph [0034]).

Regarding **Claim 16**, Talwar further teaches wherein at least one voice assistant of the plurality

of voice assistants is native to the interface and at least one voice assistant of the plurality of voice

assistants is non-native to the interface (see Fig.1 (102,104,170,172) and paragraph [0014], front end

and back end voice assistants).

Regarding **Claim 15**, Talwar further teaches wherein determining the voice assistant for

servicing the command includes processing the voice command according to a user interaction

model (see Fig.2 (222,224) and paragraph [0047], utilizing language model).

Regarding **Claim 14,** Choi further teaches wherein the monitoring includes processing the interaction between the voice assistant and the user according to a user interaction model (see Fig.4 (S424,S436) and paragraph [0129]).

Regarding **Claim 13,** Choi further teaches wherein the monitoring includes determining when the voice assistant has finished service the command (see Fig.4 (S424,S436) and paragraph [0129]).

Regarding **Claim 12**, Talwar further teaches wherein the interaction between the voice assistant and the user is monitored by the interface (see Fig.6 (10,640) and paragraphs [0138-0140], the interface of figure 6 includes a dialog manager module for tracking the context of the user interaction with the system).

Regarding **Claim 1**, Talwar further teaches processing the representation of the spoken utterance to identify, from a plurality of candidate domains, a request and a serving domain (see Fig.3 (340,350), paragraph [0030] and paragraph [0067]), based on a semantic content of the utterance (see Fig.1 (173), Fig.3 (350), paragraph [0015], paragraph [0047] and paragraph [0064]); and routing the request to a personal assistant based on the request and the serving domain (see Fig.1 (174), Fig.3(370) and paragraph [0069-0070]).

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Talwar et al. (US Pub. 2019/0311713 A1) and Choi et al. (US Pub. 2016/0336024 A1), and in further view of Wolverton et al. (US Patent 9,798,799 B2).

Regarding **Claim 2**, Talwar teaches processing the representation of the spoken utterance to identify, from a plurality of candidate domains, a request and a serving domain (see Fig.3 (340,350), paragraph [0030] and paragraph [0067]), but Talwar and Choi fail to teach identifying the request and serving domain by utilizing the location information of the speaker.

Wolverton, however, teaches fulfilling a specific request from a user by utilizing the geographical location of the user (see Fig.1 (112) and Col.32, Line 4-28, geographical location of the speaker).

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art, before the effective filing date of the application, to include to the method of Claim 1 the step for identifying the request and serving domain based on the location information of the speaker. The motivation would be to select an appropriate domain to fulfill a specific task that is requested by the user.

Regarding **Claim 4**, Talwar teaches processing the representation of the spoken utterance to identify, from a plurality of candidate domains, a request and a serving domain (see Fig.3 (340,350), paragraph [0030] and paragraph [0067]), but Talwar and Choi fail to teach identifying the request and serving domain by obtaining the current weather condition information.

Wolverton, however, teaches fulfilling a specific request from a user by utilizing the current weather condition Information for fulfilling a specific task for the user (see Fig.3 (306) and Col.21, Line 41-51).

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art, before the effective filing date of the application, to include to the method of Claim 1 the step for identifying the request and serving domain based on a current weather condition information. The motivation would be to select an appropriate domain to fulfill a specific task that is needed for the user or driver of a vehicle.

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Talwar et al. (US Pub. 2019/0311713 A1) and Choi et al. (US Pub. 2016/0336024 A1), and in further view of Selvaggi et al. (US Pub. 2020/0234698 A1).

Regarding **Claim 3**, Talwar teaches processing the representation of the spoken utterance to identify, from a plurality of candidate domains, a request and a serving domain (see Fig.3

(340,350), paragraph [0030] and paragraph [0067]), but Talwar and Choi fail to teach identifying the request and serving domain by utilizing the time of day information.

Selvaggi, however, teaches fulfilling a specific request from a user by utilizing the time of day information (see paragraph [0055]).

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art, before the effective filing date of the application, to include to the method of Claim 1 the step for identifying the request and serving domain based on the time of day information. The motivation would be to select a domain for completing tasks relating to scheduling and calendar functions.

Regarding **Claim 5**, Talwar teaches processing the representation of the spoken utterance to identify, from a plurality of candidate domains, a request and a serving domain (see Fig.3 (340,350), paragraph [0030] and paragraph [0067]), but Talwar and Choi fail to teach identifying the request and serving domain by utilizing the calendar information of the speaker.

Selvaggi, however, teaches fulfilling a specific request from a user by utilizing the calendar information of the speaker (see paragraph [0055]).

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art, before the effective filing date of the application, to include to the method of Claim 1 the step for identifying the request and serving domain based on the calendar information of the speaker. The motivation would be to select a domain for completing tasks relating to scheduling and appointment functions.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Talwar et al. (US Pub. 2019/0311713 A1) and Choi et al. (US Pub. 2016/0336024 A1), and in further view of Leeb (US Pub. 2018/0261216 A1).

Regarding **Claim 6,** Talwar and Choi teaches the method of Claim 1 but fail to teach identifying a plurality of candidate personal assistants based on the request and the serving domain and computing a

match score of the request and each candidate personal assistant, in which the request is routed to the

personal assistant having the maximum match score from among the candidates.

Leeb, however, teaches identifying a plurality of domain relating to a specific user request,

computing a match score for the request and each domain and selecting the domain with the

highest match score (see Fig. 1A (11,12,13,17), paragraphs [0029-0030] and paragraphs [0032-0033]).

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art, before the effective filing date of the

application, to include to the method of Claim 1 the steps for identifying a plurality of candidate

personal assistants based on the request and the serving domain and computing a match score of the

request and each candidate personal assistant, in which the request is routed to the personal assistant

having the maximum match score from among the candidates. The motivation would be to select the

best available domain or personal assistant to complete the requested task for the user.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7-10 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The prior art of record does not teach, disclose or suggest the claimed limitation of (in

combination with all other limitations in the claim) "wherein a match score of a particular personal

assistant is reduced if routing the request to the particular personal assistant would result in a pre-

determined dangerous condition", as found in Claim 7. Similar features are claimed in Claims 8-10.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment

of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such

submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VU B HANG whose telephone number is (571)272-0582.

Examiner interviews are available via telephone, in-person, and video conferencing using a USPTO supplied web-based collaboration tool. To schedule an interview, applicant is encouraged to use the USPTO Automated Interview Request (AIR) at http://www.uspto.gov/interviewpractice.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad H. Ghayour, can be reached at (571)272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see https://ppair-my.uspto.gov/pair/PrivatePair. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/VU B HANG/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2672

Doc code: IDS
Doc description: Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) Filed

PTO/SB/08a (02-18)
Approved for use through 11/30/2020. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT (Not for submission under 37 CFR 1.99)		
Application Number		17082632
Filing Date		2020-10-28
First Named Inventor	Giuseppe Iacobelli	
Art Unit		2672
Examiner Name	V. B. Hang	
Attorney Docket Number		30244-007001

U.S.PATENTS | Remove |

Examiner Initial*	Cite No	Patent Number	Kind Code[1]	Issue Date	Name of Patentee or Applicant of cited Document	Pages,Columns,Lines where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear
	1					

If you wish to add additional U.S. Patent citation information please click the Add button. | Add |

U.S.PATENT APPLICATION PUBLICATIONS | Remove |

Examiner Initial*	Cite No	Publication Number	Kind Code[1]	Publication Date	Name of Patentee or Applicant of cited Document	Pages,Columns,Lines where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear
/V.B.H/	1	20030167167	A1	2003-09-04	Gong	
/V.B.H/	2	20130072169	A1	2013-03-21	Ross et al.	

If you wish to add additional U.S. Published Application citation information please click the Add button. | Add |

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS | Remove |

Examiner Initial*	Cite No	Foreign Document Number[3]	Country Code[2]i	Kind Code[4]	Publication Date	Name of Patentee or Applicant of cited Document	Pages,Columns,Lines where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear	T[5]
/V.B.H/	1	2016085776	WO	A1	2016-06-02	Microsoft Technology Licensing, LLC		

If you wish to add additional Foreign Patent Document citation information please click the Add button | Add |

NON-PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS | Remove |

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT
(Not for submission under 37 CFR 1.99)</td><td>Application Number</td><td>17082632</td></tr>
</table>

Application Number	17082632
Filing Date	2020-10-28
First Named Inventor	Giuseppe Iacobelli
Art Unit	2672
Examiner Name	V. B. Hang
Attorney Docket Number	30244-007001

Examiner Initials*	Cite No	Include name of the author (in CAPITAL LETTERS), title of the article (when appropriate), title of the item (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, catalog, etc), date, pages(s), volume-issue number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published.	T5
	1		

If you wish to add additional non-patent literature document citation information please click the Add button | Add |

EXAMINER SIGNATURE

Examiner Signature	/VU B HANG/	Date Considered	03/29/2021

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through a citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

[1] See Kind Codes of USPTO Patent Documents at www.USPTO.GOV or MPEP 901.04. [2] Enter office that issued the document, by the two-letter code (WIPO Standard ST.3). [3] For Japanese patent documents, the indication of the year of the reign of the Emperor must precede the serial number of the patent document. [4] Kind of document by the appropriate symbols as indicated on the document under WIPO Standard ST.16 if possible. [5] Applicant is to place a check mark here if English language translation is attached.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT (Not for submission under 37 CFR 1.99)	Application Number	17082632
	Filing Date	2020-10-28
	First Named Inventor	Giuseppe Iacobelli
	Art Unit	2672
	Examiner Name	V. B. Hang
	Attorney Docket Number	30244-007001

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

Please see 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98 to make the appropriate selection(s):

☒ That each item of information contained in the information disclosure statement was first cited in any communication from a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application not more than three months prior to the filing of the information disclosure statement. See 37 CFR 1.97(e)(1).

OR

☐ That no item of information contained in the information disclosure statement was cited in a communication from a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application, and, to the knowledge of the person signing the certification after making reasonable inquiry, no item of information contained in the information disclosure statement was known to any individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) more than three months prior to the filing of the information disclosure statement. See 37 CFR 1.97(e)(2).

See attached certification statement.

The fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17 (p) has been submitted herewith.

A certification statement is not submitted herewith.

SIGNATURE

A signature of the applicant or representative is required in accordance with CFR 1.33, 10.18. Please see CFR 1.4(d) for the form of the signature.

Signature	/ Zachary J. Rimkunas /	Date (YYYY-MM-DD)	2021-03-16
Name/Print	Zachary J. Rimkunas	Registration Number	77,288

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 1 hour to complete, including gathering, preparing and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

Privacy Act Statement

The Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579) requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether the Freedom of Information Act requires disclosure of these record s.

2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.

3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.

4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).

5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.

6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).

7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (i.e., GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.

8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspections or an issued patent.

9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.