I believe my device is **unique, innovative and non-obvious** and therefore we should proceed down avenues that lead to a broader patent than a single aspect being approved. While it is an accomplishment to have any claim approved it will not serve the purpose I have envisioned. I do not plan to use a narrow patent to protect one design aspect and then later market that design aspect. Instead I plan to market my device in its entirety and must have patent protection for success. The “rapidly deployed and configured, self-contained sensor station with the ability to alert evacuees as to the state of the homes” is a true invention. It meets the standard of unique, innovative and non-obvious for the following reasons.

Unique

There are many patents for self-contained sensor stations, each one having things in common with the others. There are multiple patents with fire sensors, as well as multiple patents with flood sensors, but each is unique in the composition of sensors and the methods that tie the sensor outputs to users. In fact there are so many self-contained sensor stations that have been approved as unique that it demonstrates that the group of sensors chosen and the controller’s use of those sensors constitute a unique invention.

No single patent has my set of sensors and no patent at all ties them to users the way my sensor station does. Creating a device with such a large number and variety of sensors has been a challenge. Employing the sensors to detect home conditions from within a self-contained device is also challenging. And even after a disaster has been detected the method for alerting users is different than any other sensor station.

Absolutely no other patent talked about rapid deployment and configuration the way mine does. The idea to allow the user to send a single text message to the device for configuring it is extremely important. I see users rushing from their home having done no preparation for setting up my device. They simply pull it from a closet, plug it in and leave. And once safe almost all users, even those not adept with technology, can understand how to send a text message.

Innovative

It has tines and a handle….is it a fork or a comb. On the surface these two devices have similar descriptions and a user could comb their hair with a fork or eat with a comb. But they are clearly separate inventions. But now comes the afro-pick….is it innovative even though its a type of comb that looks like a fork? Yes it is because it is new. Functionally it’s a comb that appears like a big fork but the arrangement of its tines, their bluntness and its handle are all innovations.

My device is functionally like, and has the ‘appearance’ of, other emergency alert systems. But its composition of sensors and their use as to sense disasters surrounding a home make it new. No other sensor station has so many sensors for such a wide variety of disasters. I know we would like to patent any disaster alert sensor station but perhaps it is time to focus on the specific innovations of my approach. I use 6 different types of sensors and each one is looking for a different disaster that could destroy or at least affect a home.

Non-obvious

Prior to the 1960s if someone had, and I believe many people did, said “build a multi-stage chemical rocket and it can fly to the moon” did that teach how to make the Saturn 5 rocket? Obviously no. No one knew what combination of technologies would be successful for the moon shot. It took many engineers working many years to learn how to build the Saturn 5 rocket system and a simple description did not lead to their final invention.

Likewise, saying “signal with a text message” does not teach the details necessary for a skilled engineer to duplicate my text messaging approach. If an engineer were told to “send a text message” either they would

have to ask for a more detailed description or it would be unlikely that their design would employ the direct text messaging approach.

The addition of a requirement that my device work when the cell system is struggling is what led to the exact design. And by imposing a new requirement a new approach had to be employed. The new approach was not ‘taught’ to me by someone saying “send a text message.”