

Clarke, Modet

COLOMBIA

P-3204

SUPERINTENDENCIA DE INDUSTRIA Y COMERCIO



No. 12-011855- -00007-0000

Fecha: 2014-01-31 16:09:38 Dep. 2020 DIR.NUEVASCR
Tra. 11 PATENTEIYII Eve: 378 FASENACIONALI
Act. 412 REPOSPRESRECU Folios: 31

SUPERINTENDENCIA DE INDUSTRIA Y COMERCIO
DIVISION DE NUEVAS CREACIONES
E. S. D.

Re: Expediente No. **12-011.855**
Solicitud de patente a nombre de **DEAL MAGIC, INC. y SAVI TECHNOLOGY INC.**

Yo, SILVANA MARIA LOPEZ DÍAZ, identificada como aparece al pie de mi firma, domiciliada en la carrera 11 A No. 86-53, piso 6, y actuando como apoderada sustituta de acuerdo con la sustitución presentada el 7 de octubre de 2013 de las sociedades DEAL MAGIC, INC. y SAVI TECHNOLOGY INC., domiciliadas en estados Unidos de América, solicitantes de la patente de la referencia, interpongo recurso de reposición contra la resolución **No.78982** emitida el 17 de diciembre de 2013 por el Superintendente de Industria y Comercio, por medio de la cual se niega el privilegio de patente de invención para la solicitud contenida en el expediente de la referencia.

Con fundamento en la facultad que confiere el artículo 34 de la Decisión 486 al solicitante para modificar la solicitud de patente en cualquier momento del trámite, presento junto con este memorial un nuevo capítulo reivindicatorio, el cual consta de 9 reivindicaciones y reemplaza completamente el capítulo presentado anteriormente.

Así las cosas, cabe aclarar que el nuevo capítulo reivindicatorio que consta de 9 reivindicaciones y la materia contenida en dichas reivindicaciones corresponde a la misma materia de las reivindicaciones allegadas con la solicitud original el 26 de enero de 2012, las cuales fueron modificadas en respuesta al oficio No. 11754 notificado por fijación en lista el 16 de julio de 2013, con la diferencia que se ha incluido la nueva reivindicación 6 que contiene las limitaciones de la antigua reivindicación 13 presentada con la solicitud original.

Conforme a lo anterior, es claro que las modificaciones realizadas al capítulo reivindicatorio no amplían de ninguna manera la materia objeto de la presente solicitud y se realizaron con el ánimo de superar las objeciones de novedad planteadas por el examinador en la resolución.

Atentamente nos permitimos decir que se adjunta recibo por tasa de modificación y no por reivindicaciones adicionales, toda vez que el nuevo capítulo reivindicatorio cuenta menos cláusulas que el originalmente presentado.

1. FUNDAMENTOS DEL RECURSO

1.1 La indebida interpretación del artículo 16 de la Decisión 486/00.

Es deseo del solicitante presentar argumentos contra las declaraciones de esa Superintendencia indicando como primera medida que el examinador no realizó una

1/31

adecuada interpretación del artículo 16 de la Decisión 486/00 y parte de premisas erradas, en cuanto a la supuesta falta de novedad de la materia objeto de la presente invención, y realiza un equivocado análisis de los requisitos en cuestión, para finalmente negar sin justificación la patente para la solicitud en comento.

En este sentido, volvemos sobre el particular de que el artículo 16 de la Decisión 486/00 determina que *“Una invención es nueva cuando no está comprendida en el estado de la técnica. El estado de la técnica comprenderá todo lo que haya sido accesible al público, por una descripción escrita u oral, por una utilización o cualquier otro medio antes de la fecha de presentación de la solicitud de patente o, en su caso, de la prioridad reconocida”*. (El subrayado es nuestro).

De lo anterior, es claro que para determinar si una invención es novedosa o no, el examinador de patentes debe primero cerciorarse que ésta no se encuentre dentro del estado de la técnica.

El estado de la técnica es el conjunto de conocimientos técnicos dentro del campo de la invención que hayan sido publicados por cualquier medio, antes de la fecha de solicitud de la invención o de la prioridad reivindicada.

Una vez se determina el estado de la técnica, el examinador debe compararlo frente a la invención, elemento por elemento, con el fin de establecer si existe alguna diferencia entre ellos.

Así entonces, es claro que para que un documento pueda afectar la novedad de la presente solicitud de patente, dicho documento **debe revelar todas las características técnicas reivindicadas en la presente invención**. De lo contrario, si se demuestra que existe al menos una (1) característica técnica de la invención que no ha sido divulgada en los documentos citados, la objeción formulada por novedad se debe tener por superada.

Adicionalmente, se llama la atención del Examinador en cuanto a que para que la invención pierda su calidad de novedosa, es claro que ella, TODA ELLA, ha de estar contenida en el “conjunto de conocimientos existentes que son aplicables al proceso industrial” como define el estado de la técnica el Tribunal de justicia del Acuerdo de Cartagena (Proceso No. 6-IP-89, sentencia de 31 de octubre de 1989, publicada en Jurisprudencia del Tribunal de Justicia del Acuerdo de Cartagena, Tomo 11, BID-INTAL, Buenos Aires, 1994, página 60).

Esto se conoce como NOVEDAD ABSOLUTA, de conformidad con lo cual para desvirtuar el requisito de novedad de una invención será necesario que lo reivindicado por la invención bajo estudio corresponda de forma total con lo revelado en cada uno de los documentos señalados por el Examinador, conclusión a la que se llega después de un análisis exhaustivo mediante una comparación entre el capítulo reivindicatorio de la invención en estudio y las anterioridades citadas por el ese Despacho.

Ahora bien, si un determinado elemento, condición o circunstancia de la nueva creación ya hace parte del estado de la técnica no quiere ello decir, desde luego, que la invención deba ser rechazada por carecer del requisito de novedad. No sin razón ha

2

dicho el mencionado Tribunal: "hay que advertir que toda creación es en cierta forma, producto del estado de la técnica existente, en el sentido de que el inventor ha de tener en cuenta un conjunto de conocimientos técnicos que le permitan crear nuevos procedimientos aplicables a la industria" (Ibídem, páginas 53 y 54).

Por lo tanto y teniendo en cuenta lo anteriormente expuesto, como mínimo la novedad debe contemplar los siguientes aspectos:

- Que la invención en estudio esté contenida de forma TOTAL y ABSOLUTA en cada uno de los documentos que se mencionan como anterioridad; y
- Que la invención en cuestión puede partir de conocimientos conocidos, caso en el cual habrá que hacer la comparación no de lo conocido sino de lo inédito y novedoso, teniendo que analizarse el valor agregado que aporta la invención con sus nuevas características al campo técnico al cual pertenece la solicitud en estudio.

Aplicando lo anterior al caso concreto, para que las razones que aduce el examinador para desvirtuar la novedad fuesen ciertas, sería forzoso que se demostrara que la invención en estudio está comprendida en el estado de la técnica de forma TOTAL, específicamente en el documento D1 citado por el examinador.

En vista de lo anterior, el solicitante desea que se tengan en cuenta los siguientes argumentos, los cuales demuestran que la solicitud de la referencia cumple con los requisitos de novedad.

Es deseo del solicitante indicar que las reivindicaciones independientes 1 y 7 describen características que permiten determinar que la coordenada de posición de una etiqueta de rastreo es imprecisa y actualizar la coordenada de posición imprecisa para que corresponda con la ubicación esperada asociada con un evento detectado. Por ejemplo, el evento es un evento predefinido que se espera que ocurra en una ubicación determinada (como una ubicación de inspección de aduana). De esta forma, si un evento de incumplimiento autorizado ocurre indicando una inspección de aduana y la etiqueta de rastreo está dentro del umbral de distancia de la ubicación de inspección de aduana, la coordenada de posición de la etiqueta puede ser actualizada a la ubicación conocida de la ubicación de inspección de aduana en respuesta al recibimiento de una notificación del evento (ver párrafo 50 del capítulo descriptivo).

Así, es deseo del solicitante manifestar que la característica novedosa de las nuevas reivindicaciones 1 y 7 consiste en que la ubicación de la etiqueta de rastreo es actualizada o corregida a la ubicación esperada de un evento detectado. Aunque el sistema y método descrito en el documento D1 incluye determinar ubicaciones de activos y corregir errores, dicho documento no menciona ni sugiere la corrección de errores en la ubicación mediante el mecanismo descrito en las nuevas reivindicaciones 1 y 7.

Considerando lo anterior, es claro que las nuevas reivindicaciones 1 y 7 contienen al menos una diferencia técnica con el estado de la técnica, por lo que deben ser consideradas novedosas.

1.2 La nueva reivindicación 6 cumple con el requisito de novedad

Es deseo del solicitante indicar que la nueva reivindicación 6 que se refiere a “un método implementado en computador, que comprende: recibir, en un computador, una primera coordenada de posición para un activo, la primera coordenada de posición corresponde a una primera ubicación de un activo determinado cuando un evento de un tipo predeterminado de evento ocurre durante un embarque del activo; determinar, por el computador, si la primera coordenada de posición es imprecisa al comparar la primera ubicación con la segunda ubicación donde se esperaba ocurriera el evento; y en respuesta a la determinación que la primera coordenada de posición es imprecisa, determinar que la ubicación esperada del evento se encuentra dentro de la distancia límite de la primera coordenada de posición; y modificar, por un dispositivo de computación, la primera coordenada de posición para corresponder con la ubicación esperada del primer evento cuando la ubicación esperada se encuentra dentro de la distancia límite de la primera coordenada de posición; en donde determinar que la primera corrección de posición es imprecisa comprende: comparar la primera corrección de posición con una corrección de posición precedente y una corrección de posición posterior; y determinar que la distancia física entre la segunda corrección de posición y cualquier corrección de posición precedente o la corrección de posición posterior excede un umbral”, posee, además de las diferencias técnicas expuestas en el numeral 1.1, diferencias adicionales con el estado de la técnica, particularmente el documento D1.

Al analizar el documento D1, se encuentra que dicho documento no menciona ni sugiere los pasos del método que consisten en comparar la primera corrección de posición con una corrección de posición precedente y una corrección de posición posterior y determinar que la distancia física entre la segunda corrección de posición y cualquier corrección de posición precedente o la corrección de posición posterior excede un umbral.

En consecuencia, teniendo en cuenta los anteriores argumentos, es claro que las reivindicaciones 1 a 9 de la presente invención cumplen a cabalidad con los requisitos de novedad según el artículo 16 de la Decisión 486/00.

Adicional a los argumentos anteriormente presentados, es deseo del solicitante indicar a ese Despacho que la solicitud equivalente en Estados Unidos de América, que contiene en esencia las mismas reivindicaciones que las contenidas en la presente solicitud, fue concedida bajo el número US8432274 B2, reconociendo la Oficina de Patentes de dicho país, la novedad, el nivel inventivo y la aplicabilidad industrial de la presente invención. Copia de dicha patente se encuentra adjunto como anexo al presente memorial.

De esta forma, aunque mi solicitante reconoce el principio de independencia de las diferentes Oficinas de Propiedad Intelectual, resulta sorprendente que los requisitos de patentabilidad, los cuales son considerados conceptos universales, hayan sido reconocidos por dicha Oficina de Patente para la correspondiente invención, mientras que la Oficina Colombiana de Patentes se aparta de dicho criterio unánime.

4

Clarke, Modet & C°

COLOMBIA


5

Teniendo en cuenta lo dicho anteriormente, solicito a usted lo siguiente:

a) Que de conformidad con lo previsto por los artículos 3 (inciso 3); 35 (inciso 2) y 59 (inciso 2) del Código Contencioso Administrativo se consideren y se resuelvan **TODOS** los argumentos y **TODAS** las cuestiones planteadas así como las que aparezcan con motivo de este recurso.

b) Que se revoque la resolución No. 78982 del 17 de diciembre de 2013 expedida por el Superintendente de Industria y Comercio, y se proceda a conceder el privilegio de patente de invención a la solicitud de mi mandante.

Señor Superintendente,



SILVANA MARIA LÓPEZ DÍAZ

C.C. 22468787 de Barranquilla

T.P 147463 del CSJ

notificaciones@clarkemodet.com.co

5

DIRECCIÓN DE NUEVAS CREACIONES
MODIFICACIONES Y/O CORRECCIONES

1. Identificación del Trámite

☐ Error material

☒ Modificación a una Solicitud en trámite

☒ Patente de Invención

☐ Patente de Modelo de Utilidad

☐ Registro de Diseño Industrial

☐ Esquema de Trazado de Circuitos Integrados

2. Datos del solicitante

Persona Natural ☐

Persona Jurídica ☒

DEAL MAGIC, INC, y SAVI TECHNOLOGY, INC.

Nombre o denominación / Nombre o razón social completa

Nombre representante legal

Tipo de empresa

Micro ☐

Pequeña ☐

Mediana ☐

Otra ☐

Documento de identificación:

☐ C.C.

☐ C.E.

☐ NIT

☐ Otro

Número

Nacionalidad/País de constitución	Dirección y domicilio del titular	Ciudad
Estados Unidos de América	303 Fifth Avenue South, Suite 209 Edmonds,	Washington 98020
Estados Unidos de América	3601 Eisenhower Avenue, Suite 280 Alexandria,	Virginia 22304
Dirección electrónica	No. Fax	Número telefónico

☐

Autorizo expresamente a la Superintendencia de Industria y Comercio para que todas las comunicaciones sean enviadas a través de la dirección de correo electrónico

3. Datos del apoderado:

SILVANA MARIA LÓPEZ DÍAZ

C.C. 22.468.787

147463 CSJ

Apellidos y Nombre

Documento de identificación

Tarjeta profesional

Dirección y domicilio		Ciudad
Carrera 11 No. 86-53, Piso 6, Bogotá D.C., Colombia		Bogotá D.C.
Dirección electrónica	No. Fax	Número telefónico
notificaciones@clarkemodet.com.co	6350824	6181088

En caso de haber presentado poder general para asuntos que se adelanten ante la Delegatura de Propiedad Industrial, sírvase indicar el número de su radicación o protocolo de poder general

4. Datos del trámite

Corrección:

Expediente No. 12-011.855

Aparece _____

Debe ser _____

Modificación:

Presentación Solicitud Divisional.

Modificación al capítulo descriptivo.
☐ _____

☒ Modificación al capítulo Reivindicatorio
Presento junto con este memorial nuevo capítulo reivindicatorio, el cual consta de 9 reivindicaciones y reemplaza completamente al anteriormente presentado.

Modificación al resumen.
☐ _____

Modificación a los dibujos.
☐ _____

Modificación al solicitante.

5. Anexos

☒ Comprobante de pago de la tasa para la presentación de la corrección y/o modificación

☐ Poder, si fuere el caso.

☒ Documento que contiene las modificaciones o correcciones.

☐ Copia de la solicitud y sus anexos en formato magnético.

6. Firma

SILVANA MARIA LÓPEZ DÍAZ

Nombre y apellidos

C.C. 22.468.787

Firma

Tarjeta Profesional T.P. 147463 CSJ

SUPERINTENDENCIA DE INDUSTRIA Y COMERCIO

NIT : 800.176.089-2

-/-

Industria y Comercio
SUPERINTENDENCIA

RECIBO DE CAJA

No. 14 - 001104

Bogotá D.C., Enero 08 de 2014 - 15:18:09

RECIBIDO DE : CLARKE MODET

NI 830.008.643

*** Soporte del Pago ***

TIPO PAGO	BANCO	CUENTA	No. PAGO	FECHA PAGO	VR PAGO
CONSIGNACION	BANCO DE BOGOTA	062754387	569012835	08/01/2014	90.526.000.00

*** Conceptos Pagados ***

CANT.	RENTISTICO	CONCEPTO	Vr. UNIDITARIO	Vr. CONCEPTO
1	50005-01-03	CAMBIO DE MODALIDAD Y MODIFICACIONES EN CREACION CORRECCION A SOLICITUD EN TRAMITE / MODIFICA	128.000.00	128.000.00
				\$128.000.00

SON: **CIENTO VEINTIOCHO MIL PESOS MONEDA CORRIENTE**

Responsable:

Recibo de Caja Aplicado al Expediente No. _____

SUPERINTENDENCIA DE INDUSTRIA Y COMERCIO



No. 12-011855- -00007-0000

Fecha: 2014-01-31 16:09:38 Dep. 2020 DIR.NUEVASCR
Tra. 11 PATENTEIYII Eve: 378 FASENACIONALI
Act. 412 REPOSPRESRECU Folios: 31

Sede Centro: Carrera 13 No. 27 - 00 Pisos 3,4,5 y 10 Bogotá, D.C.- Colombia

Web: www.sic.gov.co e-mail: info@sic.gov.co Conmutador: (571) 5870000 Fax: (571) 5870284 Línea: 018000-910165 Call Center: (571) 6513240

Enero 8 de 2014 - 15:18:30

P-3204

Clarke, Modet & C°

COLOMBIA

ANEXOS

- US8432274 B2. *Contextual based determination of accuracy of position fixes.*

8

REIVINDICACIONES

1. Un método implementado en computador, que comprende:

recibir, en un computador, una primera coordenada de posición para un activo, la primera coordenada de posición corresponde a una primera ubicación de un activo determinado cuando un evento de un tipo predeterminado de evento ocurre durante un embarque del activo;

determinar, por el computador, si la primera coordenada de posición es imprecisa al comparar la primera ubicación con la segunda ubicación donde se esperaba ocurriera el evento; y

en respuesta a la determinación que la primera coordenada de posición es imprecisa, determinar que la ubicación esperada del evento se encuentra dentro de la distancia límite de la primera coordenada de posición; y

modificar, por un dispositivo de computación, la primera coordenada de posición para corresponder con la ubicación esperada del primer evento cuando la ubicación esperada se encuentra dentro de la distancia límite de la primera coordenada de posición.

2. El método de la reivindicación 1, que comprende adicionalmente:

generar una notificación que identifique el activo, el evento, y la primer coordenada de posición modificada; y

proporcionar la notificación a un usuario.

3. El método de la reivindicación 1, en donde modificar la primera coordenada de posición comprende:

determinar que el tipo del primer evento es un evento de embarque;

identificar la ubicación esperada, la ubicación esperada es una ubicación válida para el evento de embarque; y

modificar la primera coordenada de posición para indicar la ubicación esperada.

4. El método de la reivindicación 3, en donde el evento de embarque es que se inicia el embarque e identificar la ubicación actualizada comprende:

determinar si una ubicación de origen válida para el embarque está dentro de un radio umbral de la primera coordenada de posición; y

identificar la ubicación de origen válida como la ubicación válida si la ubicación de origen válida está dentro de un radio umbral de la primera

coordenada de posición, e identificar de otra forma una ubicación de origen asociada con un remitente del embarque.

5. El método de la reivindicación 4, en donde el evento de embarque es que el embarque está finalizando, e identificar la ubicación actualizada comprende:

determinar si una ubicación de destino válida para el embarque está dentro de un radio umbral de la primera coordenada de posición; y

identificar la ubicación de destino válida como la ubicación válida si la ubicación de destino válida está dentro de un radio umbral de la primera coordenada de posición, e identificar de otra forma una ubicación de destino asociada con un receptor del embarque.

6. Un método implementado en computador, que comprende:

recibir, en un computador, una primera coordenada de posición para un activo, la primera coordenada de posición corresponde a una primera ubicación de un activo determinado cuando un evento de un tipo predeterminado de evento ocurre durante un embarque del activo;

determinar, por el computador, si la primera coordenada de posición es imprecisa al comparar la primera ubicación con la segunda ubicación donde se esperaba ocurriera el evento; y

en respuesta a la determinación que la primera coordenada de posición es imprecisa, determinar que la ubicación esperada del evento se encuentra dentro de la distancia límite de la primera coordenada de posición; y

modificar, por un dispositivo de computación, la primera coordenada de posición para corresponder con la ubicación esperada del primer evento cuando la ubicación esperada se encuentra dentro de la distancia límite de la primera coordenada de posición;

en donde determinar que la primera corrección de posición es imprecisa comprende:

comparar la primera corrección de posición con una corrección de posición precedente y una corrección de posición posterior; y

determinar que la distancia física entre la segunda corrección de posición y cualquier corrección de posición precedente o la corrección de posición posterior excede un umbral.

7. Un sistema, que comprende:

una etiqueta configurada para realizar operaciones que comprende:

recibir datos de coordenada de posición para un activo; y

10

generar notificaciones que identifican correcciones de posición para eventos durante un embarque del activo;

servidores configurados para desarrollar operaciones que comprenden:

recibir una primera coordenada de posición para el activo a partir de la etiqueta, la primera coordenada de posición corresponde a una primer ubicación del activo determinado cuando un primer evento de un tipo predeterminado de evento ocurre durante el embarque del activo;

determinar que la primera coordenada de posición es imprecisa por comparación de una primera ubicación con una segunda ubicación donde se esperaba ocurriera el evento; y

basado en la determinación que la primera coordenada de posición es imprecisa, determinar que la ubicación esperada del evento se encuentra dentro de la distancia límite de la primera coordenada de posición; y

modificar la primera coordenada de posición para corresponder con la ubicación esperada del primer evento cuando la ubicación esperada se encuentra dentro de la distancia límite de la primera coordenada de posición.

8. El sistema de la reivindicación 7, que comprende:

una etiqueta configurada para realizar operaciones que comprende:

recibir datos de coordenada de posición para un activo; y

generar notificaciones que identifican correcciones de posición para eventos durante un embarque del activo;

servidores configurados para desarrollar operaciones que comprenden:

recibir una primera coordenada de posición para el activo a partir de la etiqueta, la primera coordenada de posición corresponde a una primer ubicación del activo determinado cuando un primer evento de un tipo predeterminado de evento ocurre durante el embarque del activo;

determinar si la primera coordenada de posición es imprecisa por comparación de una primera ubicación con una segunda ubicación donde se esperaba ocurriera el evento; y

sí la primera coordenada de posición es imprecisa, modificar la primera coordenada de posición para corresponder con la ubicación esperada del primer evento, en donde modificar la primera coordenada de posición comprende:

determinar que el tipo del primer evento es un evento ambiental indicando que el requerimiento ambiental para el activo ha sido violado; y

modificar la primera coordenada de posición para ser una última coordenada de posición recibida con un puntaje de precisión que satisface el valor mínimo de eventos del tipo de eventos ambientales.

9. El sistema de la reivindicación 7, que comprende:

una etiqueta configurada para realizar operaciones que comprende:

recibir datos de coordenada de posición para un activo; y

generar notificaciones que identifican correcciones de posición para eventos durante un embarque del activo;

servidores configurados para desarrollar operaciones que comprenden:

recibir una primera coordenada de posición para el activo a partir de la etiqueta, la primera coordenada de posición corresponde a una primer ubicación del activo determinado cuando un primer evento de un tipo predeterminado de evento ocurre durante el embarque del activo;

determinar si la primera coordenada de posición es imprecisa por comparación de una primera ubicación con una segunda ubicación donde se esperaba ocurriera el evento; y

sí la primera coordenada de posición es imprecisa, modificar la primera coordenada de posición para corresponder con la ubicación esperada del primer evento, en donde modificar la primera coordenada de posición comprende:

determinar que el tipo del primer evento es un evento de seguridad indicando que el activo se ha visto comprometido;

determinar que la primera ubicación se encuentre dentro de la distancia límite de una ubicación de inspección de aduanas; y

modificar la primera coordenada de posición para ser la ubicación de la inspección de aduanas.



US008432274B2

(12) **United States Patent**
Cova et al.

(10) **Patent No.:** **US 8,432,274 B2**
(45) **Date of Patent:** **Apr. 30, 2013**

- (54) **CONTEXTUAL BASED DETERMINATION OF ACCURACY OF POSITION FIXES**
- (75) Inventors: **Nicholas D. Cova**, Salt Lake City, UT (US); **Narayana C. Krishna**, Cupertino, CA (US)
- (73) Assignees: **Deal Magic, Inc.**, Edmonds, WA (US); **Savi Networks, Inc.**, Alexandria, VA (US)
- (*) Notice: Subject to any disclaimer, the term of this patent is extended or adjusted under 35 U.S.C. 154(b) by 714 days.

4,736,857 A	4/1988	Monico, Jr. et al.
5,151,684 A	9/1992	Johnsen
5,189,396 A	2/1993	Stobbe et al.
5,266,925 A	11/1993	Vercellotti et al.
5,483,666 A	1/1996	Yamada et al.
5,491,486 A	2/1996	Welles et al.
5,515,030 A	5/1996	Citron et al.
5,565,858 A	10/1996	Guthrie
5,656,996 A	8/1997	Houser
5,710,973 A	1/1998	Yamada et al.
5,752,218 A	5/1998	Harrison et al.
5,758,263 A	5/1998	Berger et al.
5,774,876 A	6/1998	Woolley et al.
5,798,460 A	8/1998	Nakagawa et al.
5,815,407 A	9/1998	Huffman et al.

(Continued)

(21) Appl. No.: **12/533,913**

(22) Filed: **Jul. 31, 2009**

(65) **Prior Publication Data**
US 2011/0025496 A1 Feb. 3, 2011

(51) **Int. Cl.**
G08B 1/08 (2006.01)

(52) **U.S. Cl.**
USPC **340/539.13**; 340/539.1; 340/572.1; 340/988; 342/357.23; 342/457; 701/468; 701/469; 705/22; 705/28

(58) **Field of Classification Search** **340/539.13**, 340/539.1, 988, 572.1; 705/22, 8, 28; 701/207, 701/213, 214, 300; 342/357.23, 457
See application file for complete search history.

(56) **References Cited**

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

690,191 A	12/1901	Saxe
3,993,987 A	11/1976	Stevens
4,233,595 A	11/1980	Landkammer
4,729,626 A	3/1988	Stieff

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

GB	2 368 174 A	4/2002
GB	2 448 482 A	10/2008

(Continued)

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

International Search Report and Written Opinion of the International Searching Authority, PCT Application Serial No. PCT/US2010/043795, Sep. 17, 2010, 11 pp.

(Continued)


Primary Examiner — Brent Swarthout

(74) *Attorney, Agent, or Firm* — Fish & Richardson P.C.

(57) **ABSTRACT**

Techniques for contextual based determination of accuracy of position fixes, and modification of the position fixes in accordance with the accuracy are disclosed. In one aspect, a position fix for an asset is received. The first position fix corresponds to a location of an event during shipment of the asset. If it is determined that the position fix is inaccurate, the position fix is modified in accordance with a type of the event.

15 Claims, 6 Drawing Sheets



13

US 8,432,274 B2

Page 2

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

5,827,965 A	10/1998	Nakagawa et al.	7,903,029 B2	3/2011	Dupray
5,861,810 A	1/1999	Nguyen	7,936,266 B2	5/2011	Francis et al.
5,959,529 A	9/1999	Kail, IV	7,937,244 B2	5/2011	Kadaba
6,026,690 A	2/2000	Nakagawa et al.	7,973,536 B2	7/2011	Kojovic et al.
6,069,563 A	5/2000	Kadner et al.	7,990,270 B2	8/2011	Mostov
6,075,443 A	6/2000	Schepps et al.	7,990,947 B2	8/2011	Twitchell et al.
6,243,005 B1	6/2001	Haimovich et al.	8,032,153 B2	10/2011	Dupray et al.
6,249,252 B1	6/2001	Dupray	8,064,935 B2	11/2011	Shamoon et al.
6,265,973 B1	7/2001	Brammall et al.	8,068,023 B2	11/2011	Dulin et al.
6,292,108 B1	9/2001	Straser et al.	8,082,094 B2 *	12/2011	Gao 701/446
6,420,971 B1	7/2002	Leck et al.	8,082,096 B2	12/2011	Dupray
6,496,766 B1	12/2002	Bernold et al.	8,135,413 B2	3/2012	Dupray
6,529,131 B2	3/2003	Wentworth	8,164,458 B2	4/2012	Mostov
6,571,213 B1	5/2003	Altendahl et al.	8,217,785 B2	7/2012	Steer
6,727,817 B2	4/2004	Maloney	8,228,192 B2	7/2012	Eckert et al.
6,753,775 B2	6/2004	Auerbach et al.	2001/0022558 A1	9/2001	Karr et al.
6,778,083 B2	8/2004	Auerbach et al.	2002/0104013 A1	8/2002	Ghazarian
6,792,353 B2	9/2004	Lin	2002/0111819 A1	8/2002	Li et al.
6,879,962 B1	4/2005	Smith et al.	2002/0113704 A1	8/2002	Hess
6,927,688 B2	8/2005	Tice	2003/0126024 A1	7/2003	Crampton et al.
6,965,313 B1	11/2005	Saylor et al.	2003/0137968 A1	7/2003	Lareau et al.
6,972,682 B2	12/2005	Lareau et al.	2003/0146871 A1	8/2003	Karr et al.
6,990,335 B1	1/2006	Shamoon et al.	2003/0171948 A1	9/2003	Thomas et al.
7,035,856 B1	4/2006	Morimoto	2003/0195791 A1	10/2003	Waller et al.
7,044,374 B2	5/2006	Allison et al.	2003/0222820 A1	12/2003	Karr et al.
7,072,668 B2	7/2006	Chou	2003/0227392 A1	12/2003	Ebert et al.
7,098,784 B2	8/2006	Easley et al.	2003/0233189 A1	12/2003	Hsiao et al.
7,106,244 B2	9/2006	Hsu	2004/0113933 A1	6/2004	Guler
7,113,090 B1	9/2006	Saylor et al.	2004/0124977 A1	7/2004	Biffar
7,136,830 B1	11/2006	Kuelbs et al.	2004/0126015 A1	7/2004	Hadell
7,136,832 B2	11/2006	Li et al.	2004/0183673 A1	9/2004	Nageli
7,164,986 B2	1/2007	Humphries et al.	2004/0198386 A1	10/2004	Dupray
7,193,557 B1	3/2007	Kovacich et al.	2004/0199411 A1	10/2004	Bertram et al.
7,196,621 B2	3/2007	Kochis	2004/0227630 A1	11/2004	Shannon et al.
7,212,829 B1	5/2007	Lau et al.	2004/0246130 A1	12/2004	Lambright et al.
7,239,238 B2	7/2007	Tester et al.	2004/0257225 A1	12/2004	Webb, Sr.
7,257,397 B2	8/2007	Shamoon et al.	2004/0266457 A1	12/2004	Dupray
7,274,332 B1	9/2007	Dupray	2005/0055237 A1	3/2005	Schmidtberg et al.
7,275,651 B2	10/2007	Morales et al.	2005/0091091 A1	4/2005	Bjerre et al.
7,286,683 B2	10/2007	Hadell	2005/0156736 A1	7/2005	Rajakakse et al.
7,298,327 B2	11/2007	Dupray et al.	2005/0159883 A1	7/2005	Humphries et al.
7,312,752 B2	12/2007	Smith et al.	2005/0190097 A1	9/2005	Hsu
7,315,281 B2	1/2008	Dejanovic et al.	2005/0219037 A1	10/2005	Huang et al.
7,336,152 B2	2/2008	Horwitz et al.	2005/0248454 A1	11/2005	Hanson et al.
7,336,170 B2	2/2008	Auerbach et al.	2005/0256731 A1	11/2005	Mougey et al.
7,339,469 B2	3/2008	Braun	2006/0047379 A1	3/2006	Schullian et al.
7,350,383 B1	4/2008	Kuo	2006/0054705 A1	3/2006	Garton et al.
7,382,251 B2	6/2008	Bohman et al.	2006/0101897 A1	5/2006	Masuya et al.
7,385,500 B2	6/2008	Irwin	2006/0105760 A1	5/2006	Shamoon et al.
7,385,529 B2	6/2008	Hersh et al.	2006/0109109 A1	5/2006	Rajakakse et al.
7,391,321 B2	6/2008	Twitchell, Jr.	2006/0116893 A1	6/2006	Carnes et al.
7,394,361 B1	7/2008	Twitchell, Jr.	2006/0145837 A1	7/2006	Horton et al.
7,423,535 B2	9/2008	Chung et al.	2006/0155591 A1	7/2006	Altat et al.
7,467,032 B2	12/2008	Kane et al.	2006/0202824 A1	9/2006	Carroll et al.
7,471,203 B2	12/2008	Worthy et al.	2006/0229895 A1	10/2006	Kodger
7,482,920 B2	1/2009	Joao	2006/0232398 A1	10/2006	Nedblake et al.
RE40,642 E	2/2009	Harrison et al.	2006/0238332 A1	10/2006	Carle et al.
7,498,938 B2	3/2009	Ulrich	2006/0255934 A1	11/2006	Easley et al.
7,499,997 B2	3/2009	Hancock et al.	2006/0276201 A1	12/2006	Dupray
7,525,484 B2	4/2009	Dupray et al.	2006/0288744 A1	12/2006	Smith
7,536,321 B2	5/2009	Takahashi et al.	2007/0043538 A1	2/2007	Johnson et al.
7,616,116 B2	11/2009	Ehrensverd et al.	2007/0046459 A1	3/2007	Silverman et al.
7,623,033 B2	11/2009	Ainsworth et al.	2007/0056369 A1	3/2007	Griffin et al.
7,639,131 B2	12/2009	Mock et al.	2007/0115902 A1	5/2007	Shamoon et al.
7,643,823 B2	1/2010	Shamoon et al.	2007/0120381 A1	5/2007	Ehrensverd et al.
7,652,576 B1	1/2010	Crossno et al.	2007/0145130 A1	6/2007	Danilewitz
7,668,532 B2	2/2010	Shamoon et al.	2007/0150379 A1	6/2007	Vernaci et al.
7,688,207 B2	3/2010	Fritch et al.	2007/0155379 A1	7/2007	Shamoon et al.
7,707,076 B1	4/2010	Whiteley et al.	2007/0167179 A1	7/2007	Shamoon et al.
7,714,778 B2	5/2010	Dupray	2007/0182556 A1	8/2007	Rado et al.
7,724,138 B2	5/2010	Horwitz et al.	2007/0222232 A1	9/2007	Held
7,746,228 B2	6/2010	Sensenig et al.	2007/0222674 A1	9/2007	Tan et al.
7,760,103 B2	7/2010	Frank	2007/0252696 A1	11/2007	Belisle et al.
7,764,231 B1	7/2010	Karr et al.	2007/0262861 A1	11/2007	Anderson et al.
7,822,580 B2	10/2010	Mustonen	2007/0285232 A1	12/2007	Bohman et al.
7,830,852 B2	11/2010	Twitchell, Jr.	2007/0287473 A1	12/2007	Dupray
7,853,480 B2	12/2010	Taylor et al.	2008/0006696 A1	1/2008	Piersol et al.
7,864,061 B2	1/2011	Frank	2008/0040244 A1	2/2008	Ricciuti et al.
			2008/0042809 A1	2/2008	Watts et al.

14

US 8,432,274 B2

Page 3

2008/0086391	A1	4/2008	Maynard et al.	
2008/0094209	A1	4/2008	Braun et al.	
2008/0111693	A1	5/2008	Johnson et al.	
2008/0113672	A1	5/2008	Karr et al.	
2008/0133126	A1	6/2008	Dupray	
2008/0143516	A1	6/2008	Mock et al.	
2008/0143604	A1	6/2008	Mock et al.	
2008/0150698	A1	6/2008	Smith et al.	
2008/0157974	A1	7/2008	Boss et al.	
2008/0167049	A1	7/2008	Karr et al.	
2008/0186166	A1	8/2008	Zhou et al.	
2008/0231459	A1	9/2008	Corder	
2008/0248813	A1	10/2008	Chatterjee et al.	
2008/0252428	A1	10/2008	Robinson et al.	
2008/0309487	A1	12/2008	Chao	
2009/0030715	A1	1/2009	Robb et al.	
2009/0060349	A1*	3/2009	Linaker et al.	382/209
2009/0083123	A1	3/2009	Powell et al.	
2009/0102657	A1	4/2009	Evans et al.	
2009/0102660	A1	4/2009	Evans et al.	
2009/0121877	A1	5/2009	Henderson	
2009/0134999	A1	5/2009	Dobson et al.	
2009/0135000	A1	5/2009	Twitchell, Jr.	
2009/0135015	A1	5/2009	Dobson et al.	
2009/0140886	A1	6/2009	Bender	
2009/0146805	A1	6/2009	Joao	
2009/0146832	A1	6/2009	Ebert et al.	
2009/0167536	A1	7/2009	Clark et al.	
2009/0177394	A1	7/2009	Walz et al.	
2009/0201169	A1	8/2009	d'Hont et al.	
2009/0216775	A1	8/2009	Ratliff et al.	
2009/0234493	A1	9/2009	Pandit et al.	
2009/0308000	A1	12/2009	Corcoran	
2009/0316682	A1	12/2009	Twitchell et al.	
2009/0322510	A1	12/2009	Berger et al.	
2009/0326971	A1	12/2009	Piccinini et al.	
2010/0012653	A1	1/2010	Ulrich et al.	
2010/0039284	A1	2/2010	Hall et al.	
2010/0045436	A1	2/2010	Rinkes	
2010/0066501	A1	3/2010	Ulrich et al.	
2010/0066561	A1	3/2010	Ulrich et al.	
2010/0073229	A1	3/2010	Pattabiraman et al.	
2010/0076902	A1	3/2010	Kraft	
2010/0090822	A1	4/2010	Benson et al.	
2010/0095864	A1	4/2010	Forbes	
2010/0102964	A1	4/2010	Steer	
2010/0116932	A1	5/2010	Helou, Jr.	
2010/0141393	A1	6/2010	Daniel	
2010/0141445	A1	6/2010	Venkatasubramaniyam et al.	
2010/0145739	A1	6/2010	Erhart et al.	
2010/0234045	A1	9/2010	Karr et al.	
2010/0238032	A1	9/2010	Greene	
2010/0277280	A1	11/2010	Burkart et al.	
2010/0312715	A1	12/2010	Esque et al.	
2011/0012731	A1	1/2011	Stevens	
2011/0050397	A1	3/2011	Cova	
2011/0050423	A1	3/2011	Cova et al.	
2011/0050424	A1	3/2011	Cova et al.	
2011/0054979	A1	3/2011	Cova et al.	
2011/0120199	A1	5/2011	Auerbach et al.	
2011/0128143	A1	6/2011	Daniel	
2011/0133888	A1	6/2011	Stevens et al.	
2011/0133932	A1	6/2011	Tan et al.	
2011/0258930	A1	10/2011	Francis et al.	
2011/0266338	A1	11/2011	Babcock et al.	
2011/0283750	A1	11/2011	Will	
2011/0289320	A1	11/2011	Twitchell et al.	
2012/0058775	A1	3/2012	Dupray et al.	
2012/0069131	A1	3/2012	Abelow	
2012/0094638	A1	4/2012	Shamoon et al.	
2012/0182180	A1	7/2012	Wolf et al.	
2012/0190380	A1	7/2012	Dupray et al.	

WO	WO 2011/008884	1/2011
WO	WO 2011/022412	2/2011
WO	WO 2011/025821	3/2011
WO	WO 2011/025829	3/2011
WO	WO 2011/025987	3/2011

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

U.S. Appl. No. 13/569,862, filed Aug. 8, 2012, Cova et al.
U.S. Appl. No. 13/569,884, filed Aug. 8, 2012, Cova et al.
International Search Report and Written Opinion of the International Searching Authority, PCT Application Serial No. PCT/US2009/067210, received Feb. 4, 2010, 9 pp.
International Preliminary Report on Patentability, PCT Application Serial No. PCT/US2009/067210, received Jun. 23, 2011, 8 pp.
International Search Report and Written Opinion of the International Searching Authority, PCT Application Serial No. PCT/US2010/041994 filed Jul. 14, 2010, received Sep. 14, 2010, 12 pp.
International Preliminary Report on Patentability, PCT Application Serial No. PCT/US2010/041994 filed Jul. 14, 2010, received Jan. 17, 2012, 11 pp.
International Search Report and Written Opinion of the International Searching Authority, PCT Application Serial No. PCT/US2010/047042 filed Aug. 27, 2010, received Dec. 27, 2010, 11 pp.
International Preliminary Report on Patentability, PCT Application Serial No. PCT/US2010/047042 filed Aug. 27, 2010, received Feb. 28, 2012, 8 pp.
International Preliminary Report on Patentability, PCT Application Serial No. PCT/US2010/043795 filed Jul. 29, 2010, received Jan. 31, 2012, 9 pp.
International Search Report and Written Opinion of the International Searching Authority, PCT Application Serial No. PCT/US2010/045776 filed Aug. 17, 2010, received Oct. 8, 2010, 14 pp.
International Preliminary Report on Patentability, PCT Application Serial No. PCT/US2010/045776 filed Aug. 17, 2010, received Feb. 21, 2012, 9 pp.
International Search Report and Written Opinion of the International Searching Authority, PCT Application Serial No. PCT/US2010/042014 filed Jul. 14, 2010, Received Sep. 14, 2010, 8 pp.
International Preliminary Report on Patentability, PCT Application Serial No. PCT/US2010/042014 filed Jul. 14, 2010, Received Jan. 17, 2012, 7 pp.
International Search Report and Written Opinion of the International Searching Authority, PCT Application Serial No. PCT/US2010/046655, mailed Oct. 20, 2010, 9 pp.
International Preliminary Report on Patentability, PCT Application Serial No. PCT/US2010/046655, mailed Mar. 8, 2012, 8 pp.
International Search Report and Written Opinion of the International Searching Authority, PCT Application Serial No. PCT/US2010/046640 filed Aug. 25 2010, mailed Oct. 18, 2010, 9 pp.
International Preliminary Report on Patentability, PCT Application U.S. Appl. No. PCT/US2010/046640 filed Aug. 25 2010, mailed Mar. 6, 2012, 8 pp.
"Hercules "Zigbee" e-Seal Bolt". Bolt eSeal Electronic Seals—TydenBrooks. Retrieved from the internet: URL<URL: <http://www.tydenbrooks.com/Products/Electronic-Seals/Bolt-eSeal.aspx>>, Aug. 2, 2012. 2 pages.
Bajikar, Sundeep. "Trusted Platform Module (TPM) based Security on Notebook PCs—White Paper", Jun. 20, 2002, Mobile Platforms Group, Intel Corporation. Retrieved from the internet: URL <http://www.intel.com/design/mobile/platform/downloads/Trusted_Platform_Module_White_Paper.pdf>, Aug. 2, 2012. 20 pages.
Chin, Le-Pong, et al. "The Role of Electronic Container Seal (E-Seal) with RFID Technology in the Container Security Initiatives." Proceedings of the International Conference on MEMS, NANO and Smart Systems 2004. ICMENS. Aug. 25-27, 2004. pp. 116-120.
FAQ, Trusted Computing group—Developers. Retrieved from the Internet: URL<<http://www.trustedcomputinggroup.org/faq/TPMFAQ/>>, Oct. 19, 2010, 2 pages.
GlobalTrak, "GlobalTrak+ Asset Monitoring Unit," 2 pages.
Liaw, M. and Cova, N., "Data Quality Delivered," A Savi Networks White Paper, copyright 2006, 19 pages.
Maersk Line, "Maersk Line Shipping Containers Worldwide". Retrieved from internet: URL<<http://www.maerskline.com/link/>>

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

NZ	541176 A	8/2005
WO	WO 03/098175	11/2003
WO	WO 2007/121508	11/2007
WO	WO 2010/077688	7/2010
WO	WO 2011/008871	1/2011

15

US 8,432,274 B2

Page 4

?page=brochure&path=/our_services/our_e-commerce_services/maerskline.com/the_shipping_process/tracking>, dated Aug. 19, 2009. 7 pages.

Reid Simmons et al., "Learning to Predict Driver Route and Destination Intent", Sep. 17-20, 2006, Proceedings of the 2006 IEEE Intelligent Transportation System Conference, pp. 127-132.

Siror, Joseph, et al. "Impact of RFID Technology on Tracking of Export Goods in Kenya." From Journal of Convergence Information Technology, vol. 5, No. 9, Nov. 2010. pp. 190-200.

* cited by examiner

16





FIG. 1

7/1

17



8

12






FIG. 3

14

19



500




FIG. 5

2

2

600 ↗




FIG. 6

22

CONTEXTUAL BASED DETERMINATION OF ACCURACY OF POSITION FIXES

TECHNICAL FIELD

This subject matter is related generally to determination of accuracy of position fixes.

BACKGROUND

A wireless monitoring and tracking electronic device (Tag), can use various technologies such as GPS, RFID, and GPRS to track movements of an asset on which the Tag is mounted. The Tag can monitor for various events affecting the asset and generate position fix data corresponding to the asset's position at the time the events occurred. However, this position fix data is not always accurate.

SUMMARY

Techniques for contextual based determination of accuracy of position fixes, and modification of the position fixes in accordance with the accuracy are disclosed. In one aspect, a first position fix for an asset is received, and the accuracy of the first position fix is determined. If the position fix is inaccurate, the position fix is modified based on a type of an event associated with the position fix. Events can include process events, security events, environmental events, and tracking events for the asset. Other implementations are disclosed which are directed to systems, methods, and apparatus including computer-readable mediums.

Particular embodiments of the subject matter described in this specification can be implemented to realize one or more of the following advantages. Position fixes can be adjusted according to business logic corresponding to a type of an event. More accurate position information can be provided to a user tracking an asset. Outlier position fixes can be identified and handled according to a type of corresponding event. False notifications (e.g., notifications generated because position fix data indicates an asset has moved when it has not) can be eliminated.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

FIG. 1 is a block diagram of an example tag system that associates a Tag with an asset and monitors and tracks the asset using data received from the Tag.

FIG. 2 illustrates the journey of an asset from an origin location to a destination location.

FIG. 3 illustrates an example of error in position fixes.

FIGS. 4A and 4B illustrate example satellite geometries.

FIG. 5 is a histogram illustrating example error in GPS position fixes.

FIG. 6 is a flow diagram of an example process for identifying and correcting an inaccurate position fix.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION

Example Tag System

FIG. 1 is a block diagram of an example tag system 100 that associates a Tag with an asset (e.g., a shipping container, equipment, or other devices capable of being tracked) and tracks the asset using data received from the Tag. The system 100 commissions (associates) Tags to assets, decommissions (disassociates) Tags from assets, provides notifications of

events (e.g., security, environmental, process, and tracking events), and can reset tag status remotely.

In some implementations, the system 100 can include one or more ZCC input devices 102, an information service 104, one or more end user systems 106, Tag Logistics personnel (TL personnel) 108, one or more assets 110, one or more Tags 111 affixed or coupled to the one or more assets 110, an event server 112, an event database 113, a Tag Pool Management System (TPMS) 114, a tag database 116, a message server 118, an Integrated Voice Response (IVR) system 120, a transaction (TXN) server 124, and a failed transaction database 126.

The ZCC input devices 102 are used to commission and decommission Tags to assets. The ZCC input devices 102 can be any suitable communication device, including but not limited to mobile phones, land phones, email devices, and portable computers. The ZCC input devices 102 communicate with the information service 104 using a variety of communication modes, including but not limited to: IVR, Short Message Service (SMS), email, hand-held application, Web interface, and Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) or any other form of electronic message sharing. The ZCC input devices 102 can be operated by various actors having various roles in the supply chain, including but not limited to: dock workers, longshoreman, logistics service providers, freight forwarders, field agents, customs agents and any other personnel involved in the tracking of an asset.

The information service 104 allows end user systems 106 to track the status of assets 110 in real-time. The transaction server 124 runs a tracking application that receives event location/status transaction messages (e.g., event notifications) or reports from the event server 112 and applies business logic 122 to the transactions for validating and maintaining associations between Tag identifiers and asset identifiers. Successful transactions are posted against assets and Tags. Failed transactions and reason codes are written to an exception queue in the failed transaction database 126.

The information service 104 can include a Web server (not shown) for providing Web forms to end user systems 106 (e.g., a browser on a PC or mobile device). The Web forms provide an input mechanism for a user to commission or decommission Tags and to receive real-time tracking and status information regarding assets and events. An example information service 104 is SaviTrak™ provided by Savi Networks, LLC (Mountain View, Calif.).

The Tag 111 can be, for example, a GPS/GPRS electronic device that can be affixed or coupled to the asset being tracked. An example Tag 111 is the Savi Networks SN-LSE-01, which is a GPS-based Location+Security+Environmental Tag. The Tag 111 wakes up periodically to initiate communication with the event server 112 and to send event notifications to the event server 112. In general, each event notification includes an identification of the event (or event type), a location of the asset when the event occurred, and optionally additional details of the event such as a date and/or time when the event occurred, the status of the asset before, during, or after the event, or details on the movement of the asset (e.g., accelerometer or velocimeter readings from the Tag). The event information can be stored in the event database 113. The Tag 111 reports various events, including for example, security events, environmental events, process events, and tracking events. Security events indicate that the asset may have been tampered with. For example, the Tag 111 can report when a vertical or horizontal bolt securing the Tag 111 to a container is cut (indicating that the container was opened). Other types of tampers can also be detected (e.g., shock intrusion or illuminance inside the container that is beyond a

threshold range, indicating that the container may have been opened). Environmental events indicate that one or more environmental variables (e.g., temperature, humidity, shock, acceleration) are beyond an acceptable range (e.g., a range specified by the user). Process events indicate that various procedural events in the journey of the asset have occurred. For example, process events can indicate that a Tag has been attached to a container or detached from a container (e.g., that an asset is beginning or ending its tagged journey). Process events can also indicate other shipment events in the journey of the asset (e.g., procedural events in the journey of the asset), including, but not limited to that an asset has been stuffed (e.g., filled with contents), that an asset has been sealed, that an asset has been flagged for customs inspection, that customs inspection of an asset has begun, that customs inspection of an asset has ended, that an asset is in a shipping yard, that an asset has left a shipping yard, that an asset has sailed, that an asset has been berthed, and that an asset has been unsealed. Tracking events are periodic reports of the Tag's 111 location. For example, the Tag 111 can send a report of its current location according to a schedule, for example, at fixed intervals of time, regardless of whether any other events have been issued. The system can process the tracking events to determine when an asset has entered or left a predefined area. For example, the system can define geofences (e.g., a virtual perimeter) around important locations along the journey of the asset (e.g., ports) and the Tag 111 can use these geofences and the location provided by the tracking events to determine when the Tag 111 enters or leaves a geofence.

The Tag 111 does not have to use GPS to determine its location, but can alternatively or additionally use various location techniques including, but not limited to: wireless networks, triangulation from cellular towers, or Skyhook Wireless™ technology. In some implementations, the Tag 111 also processes commands (e.g., Over-the-Air (OTA) commands) received from the event server 112 (e.g., during a communication session with the event server 112).

The event server 112 periodically receives event notifications from the Tag 111. The event server 112 also constructs and sends commands to the Tag 111. Some notification management functions performed by the event server 112 include but are not limited to: checking incoming notifications for syntax errors and population of mandatory fields, checking the accuracy of location information in incoming notifications, sorting or sequencing notifications logically before forwarding the notifications to the information service 104, and constructing output transactions that comply with processing logic. The event server can receive and store GPS fixes. GPS fixes can be received during sessions. For example, a session can consist of a four hour window during which position fixes are received every half an hour. The event server 112 can maintain the position fixes from the previous session (or previous sessions) and can also maintain the last good fix (e.g., the last accurate fix received from the Tag, or a position fix whose location has been corrected by the system, for example, as described below with reference to FIG. 6.)

In some implementations, the TPMS 114 maintains an inventory of Tags 111 in the tag database 116. The TPMS 114 also maintains the association of the asset identifier (ID) and Tag ID and the logical state or status of the Tag 111, such as 'In Use,' 'Available,' 'Begin Journey,' 'End Journey,' etc. The TPMS 114 also maintains the allocation and availability of Tags 111 for logistics and pre-positioning purposes.

In some implementations, the TPMS 114 allows the TL personnel 108 to perform housekeeping functions, such as Tag forecasts, ordering new Tags, detecting lost Tags, billing

management, salvage and environmental disposal of failed Tags, inventory tracking, customer help desk and financial accounting. The TPMS 114 allows the TL personnel 108 to monitor the state of a Tag 111 'in journey', trouble shoot causes for failure in communicating with the event server 112, and locate lost Tags. The TPMS 114 provides analytic tools to monitor Tag network performance (e.g., GPS/GPRS coverage/roaming area for trade lanes).

The tag system 100 is one example infrastructure. Other infrastructures are also possible which contain more or fewer subsystems or components than shown in FIG. 1. For example, one or more of the servers or databases shown in FIG. 1 can be combined into a single server or database. As another example, Tags can be associated with assets using dedicated handheld devices.

Examples of Event Notifications During an Asset's Journey

FIG. 2 illustrates the journey of an asset from an origin location 202 to a destination location 204. As the asset travels from the origin location 202 to the destination location 204, a Tag associated with the asset issues various event notifications. During the trip, the asset can travel on various conveyances including, but not limited to, trucks, trains, ships, and airplanes.

When the Tag is first attached to the asset, the Tag generates a process event notification 206 indicating that the Tag is being commissioned (e.g., associated with the asset) and that the Tag and the asset are beginning their journey. Process events generally occur at known locations, such as a warehouse from which the asset is being shipped. These locations can optionally be associated with geofences that define the boundaries of the locations.

As the asset continues on its journey, it periodically generates tracking event notifications (e.g., event notifications 208, 210, 212, 214, and 218). These events provide updates on the current location of the asset, and can be used by the system to obtain useful information such as the path that the asset has traveled from its origin, remaining distance or estimated time to the destination, and the current location of the asset. Some of the tracking events (e.g., tracking events 208 and 218) can be used to determine that the asset has entered or left a port or other designated area (e.g., because the location is now inside or outside a geofence associated with the designated area).

As the asset rounds the Cape of Good Hope at the southern tip of Africa, the Tag generates an environmental event notification 216. This event indicates that a particular environmental condition has either exceeded or fallen below an acceptable range.

The asset eventually arrives at the destination location 204. The asset is opened before the Tag is decommissioned, and the Tag generates a security event notification 220 indicating that the asset has been opened. In some implementations, when the system receives the security event notification 220, it checks to see if the location of the security event is inside a geofence corresponding to the destination location. If so, the system automatically determines that the asset's journey has ended. In other implementations, the Tag is decommissioned before it is opened, and the Tag generates a process event notification indicating the end of the journey instead of the security event.

Each event notification described above includes a position fix (e.g., an estimation of the asset's current position based on one or more location determination technologies such as GPS, GPRS, wireless networks, triangulation from cellular

24

5

towers, or Skyhook Wireless™ technology). A system such as the tag system 100 receives and processes each event notification and provides information to end user systems (e.g., using an information service like the information service 104). The information can include event notifications (e.g., identifying the type of event, the asset, the positional fix, and the date/time of the event). The information can also include additional information extracted from or associated with the event (e.g., a map of the route taken by the asset for a location event, or an association between an event and the contents of an asset associated with the event). It is important that users be given accurate information. However, position fixes are prone to error.

Error in Position Fixes

FIG. 3 illustrates an example of error in position fixes. An asset is stationary at its actual location 302. Over time, a series of position fixes (e.g., position fixes 304, 306, 308, 310, and 312) are taken. Most of the position fixes are only a small distance away from the actual location 302. However, position fix 312 is a greater distance (e.g., distance 314) away from the actual location 302. This distance 314 is due to error between the actual location 302 and the position fix 312.

There are several causes of error for position fixes. For example, GPS-based position fixes are determined using triangulation from satellite signals. Error can occur in the position fix when a GPS receiver cannot receive signals from enough satellites (either because not enough satellites are visible, or because tall objects, such as buildings, interfere with the signal), or when the geometry of the visible satellites is close together. Errors can also occur because when assets made of a material such as steel are stacked near each other (e.g., when the assets are stacked in a storage yard), the metal can interfere with the GPS signals. In addition, effects of the atmosphere (e.g., refraction of GPS signals passing through the ionosphere and/or troposphere), multipath effects (e.g., caused when signals take multiple paths to reach the GPS receiver), shifts in satellite orbits, and selective availability (e.g., the falsification of the time reported by the signal transmitted by the satellite) can each lead to error in GPS position fixes. Other types of location determination technology can also have errors.

FIGS. 4A and 4B illustrate example satellite geometries 400 and 450. Different satellite geometries will have different dilution of precision (DOP). Low DOP is an indicator of low GPS error, while high DOP is an indication of high GPS error. In FIG. 4A, the satellites 402, 404, 406, and 408 are fairly evenly distributed around the location 410 where a position fix is being taken. Therefore, there will be low dilution of precision. In contrast, in FIG. 4B, the satellites 452, 454, 456, and 458 are clustered around the location 460 where the position fix is being taken. Therefore, they have a close geometry, and there will be high dilution of precision.

Various DOP values can be measured for a given position fix. For example, GPS receivers often calculate values for one or more of Horizontal DOP (HDOP) (a measure of the quality of latitude and longitude data), Vertical DOP (VDOP) (a measure of the quality of elevation data), Position DOP (PDOP) (a measure of the quality of the three-dimensional measurement) and Time DOP (TDOP) (a measure of the quality of the time determination). One or more of these can be used to estimate error due to dilution of precision.

Other parameters can also be used to estimate error in the GPS fix, for example, parameters from other satellite navigation systems such as the Wide Area Augmentation System (WAAS), the European Geostationary Navigation Overlay

6

Service (EGNOS), the Multi-functional Satellite Augmentation System (MSAS), Galileo, the Global Navigation Satellite System (GLONASS), and the Satellite Based Augmentation System (SEAS).

FIG. 5 is a histogram 500 illustrating example error in GPS position fixes. While FIG. 5 illustrates GPS error, other location determination techniques can have similar error histograms. As illustrated by the histogram 500, most GPS error is concentrated in the range 502 that covers small errors in position fixes (e.g., less than 50 meters). However, some error is in the range 504 that includes larger errors (e.g., 50 to 100 meters). The error has a long tail in the range 506 that extends from 100 meters past 150 meters).

Tracking systems can often tolerate low error, such as the error in ranges 502 and 504. However, tracking systems have more difficulty handling long-tail error. The techniques described below with reference to FIGS. 6 and 7 can help a tracking system handle both low and high error.

Example Process for Identifying and Correcting Inaccurate Position Fixes

FIG. 6 is a flow diagram of an example process 600 for identifying and correcting an inaccurate position fix. For convenience, the process will be described in reference to a system that performs the process. The system can be, for example, a Tag (e.g., Tag 111), an event server (e.g., event server 112), or a system that includes a Tag and an event server such as the tag system 100. The steps of process 600 need not occur sequentially or in the order described below.

The process 600 begins when the system receives a position fix corresponding to a location of an event during shipment of an asset (602). The position fix can be, for example, a GPS or GPRS position fix. When the system is a Tag, the position fix can be received, for example, from a GPS receiver on the Tag. When the system is an event server, the position fix can be received, for example, as part of an event notification received from a Tag associated with the asset. The events include, but are not limited to, the events described above with reference to FIGS. 1 and 2.

The system determines that the position fix is inaccurate (604) (e.g., is an outlier). The system can determine that the position fix is inaccurate based on one or more parameters. The parameters can include, for example, one or more of parameters that indicate the accuracy of the position fix, parameters that indicate a physical state of the asset, parameters that provide context for the event notification, parameters that indicate additional position fixes received from the same location-based source as the position fix, and parameters that indicate an accuracy of the position fix based on data received from a different location-based source. For example, parameters that indicate the accuracy of the position fix for a GPS-based position fix include, but are not limited to, HDOP, VDOP, PDOP, TDOP, number of satellites seen, and number of satellites used. Parameters that indicate a physical state of the asset include, but are not limited to, parameters that specify whether the asset is moving or stationary, parameters that indicate how fast the asset is moving (e.g., velocimeter readings), parameters that indicate how much the asset is accelerating (e.g., accelerometer readings), and parameters that indicate the heading direction of the asset. Parameters that provide context for the event notification include, but are not limited to, data describing the shipment of the asset and status during shipment (e.g. shipment status updates from ocean carriers, vessel sailing schedules, and train schedules, CODECO data and COARRI data). This data can describe, for example, an anticipated timeline for the shipment of the

25

asset, an actual timeline of the shipment of the asset, and whether particular milestones during the travel of the asset have been reached. Context parameters can also include details about conveyances on which the asset is traveling, for example, ship tracking information available from an external service that aggregates ship location information. Context parameters can also include other reports of an asset's location generated by various systems that interact with the asset, for example, radiation portal monitors, RFID readers, optical character recognition (OCR) systems at gates, terminal operating systems, guard station systems, warehouse management systems, customs, etc. Parameters that indicate additional position fixes received from the location-based source can include position fixes that precede and succeed the position fix whose accuracy is being tested. Parameters that indicate the accuracy of a position fix received from a different location-based source can be generated, for example, from another receiver on the Tag (e.g., for cellular triangulation or for signals received from another source of location determination data) and can include, for example, a position fix according to the different location-based source, or a measure of the accuracy of the original position fix. The parameters from a different location-based source can optionally include parameters for the accuracy of the alternative position fix.

The system can use various heuristics to determine that the position fix is an outlier. In some implementations, the system compares one or more of the parameters to a threshold. In some implementations, the threshold for a given parameter is the same for all event types. In other implementations, the threshold is different for different event types. For example, each event can be associated with a corresponding measure of how critical the event is in the context of a typical asset's journey. For example, process and security events can be considered to have "critical" importance because process events define the beginning and end of the journey, and security events indicate that the integrity of the asset has been compromised. In contrast, environmental, tracking, and location events can be considered to have only "high" importance. The threshold for a given parameter and a given event type can be based on how critical the event type is. For example, in some implementations, more critical events can have a narrower acceptable range than less critical events, because it is important that the data for the events be accurate. In alternative implementations, more critical events can have a broader acceptable range than less critical events, because it is important that the event notification be received, even if the data is slightly inaccurate.

In some implementations, the measure of how critical the event is can be further based on the needs of the user. For example, if the contents of the asset are extremely temperature sensitive, then environmental events can have a low threshold, so that they will be reported even when the position fix is inaccurate. In some implementations, the measure of how critical the event is can also be further based on the anticipated conditions during the journey of the asset. For example, if the asset is traveling through trade lanes known to have rapid temperature changes, and the contents of the asset are temperature sensitive, then environmental events can be considered more critical.

In other implementations, the system uses contextual clues to identify position fixes that are outliers. For example, if the context of the asset's shipment indicates that it should be in one location, but the position fix is in a different location, the system can identify the position fix as an outlier. For example, if an asset has been flagged for inspection by customs, then the system can identify position fixes that are not headed towards a known customs inspection location as an outlier. As

another example, if an asset has been discharged (e.g., has been unloaded from a ship), then any position fixes that indicate that the asset is in the ocean are outliers.

In other implementations, the system compares the position fix to a preceding and/or succeeding position fix and determines that the position fix is an outlier when the physical distance between the position fix and either the preceding or succeeding position fix exceeds a threshold. In some implementations, when the position fixes indicate that the asset is not moving the threshold can be determined from an accuracy factor for the device used to generate the second position fix. For example, if the distance between the readings exceeds the accuracy factor for the device, the system can determine that the position fix is an outlier. The position fixes can indicate that an asset is not moving, for example, when the velocimeter readings and/or accelerometer readings for the position fixes indicate a velocity and/or acceleration of zero, or when variables received as part of the position fix, such as ground speed or heading direction, have a value of zero. For example, an asset is not moving when it is sitting in a port waiting to be loaded onto a ship.

In some implementations, when the asset is moving (e.g., as indicated by accelerometer data, velocimeter data, or position fix data for variables such as ground speed or heading direction), the threshold can be determined from a distance (e.g., a maximum distance, an average distance, or a likely distance) that the asset could have traveled between position fixes. For example, the system can determine the distance traveled between the position fix and the subsequent position fix by multiplying a speed of the asset at the position fix by the time between the fixes. Alternatively, the system can use other contextual information about the location of the asset to determine the distance the asset could have traveled. For example, if the system knows that the asset is on a particular type of conveyance (e.g. a particular type of ship or a particular type of airplane), the system can retrieve data about the maximum (or average) speed of the conveyance, for example, by retrieving the speed data from a conveyance database. The system can then determine the distance by multiplying the speed of the conveyance type by the time between fixes. As another example, the system can use data on average speeds in a given location to determine the likely speed of the asset, and determine the distance by multiplying the average speed by the time between fixes. As another example, the distance can be the maximum distance any conveyance (or any commonly used conveyance) could travel during the time between fixes.

In some implementations, when the system determines that the asset is not moving (for example, as described above), the system plots previously received position fixes (e.g., position fixes for the current and previous session between the event server and the Tag where the asset was also not moving) and identifies the center of a cluster of the fixes (e.g., using k-means clustering or other clustering algorithms). If the position fix falls outside a given radius from the center, the position fix is an outlier. The radius can be determined, for example, based on known error in the position fix technology used in the Tag. For example, if the Tag has an error of no more than 200 feet with 99% confidence, the radius can be 200 feet.

In some implementations, when the system determines that the asset is moving, the system plots previously received position fixes and identifies a projected path for the asset (e.g., using a Rayleigh distribution). The current position fix is then evaluated against the projected path of the asset, and if the position fix differs from the path by more than a threshold radius, the position fix is considered an outlier. The radius can

26

be determined, for example, based on known error in the position fix technology used in the Tag.

In some implementations, when a given position fix indicates that an asset has entered (or left) a geofenced area, the system can determine whether the given position fix is an outlier by considering one or more subsequent position fixes. If the subsequent position fixes also indicate that the asset has entered (or left) the geofenced area, the given position fix is considered accurate. Otherwise, the given position fix is an outlier.

In other implementations, the system determines that a position fix is an outlier by comparing the position fix to both a preceding and subsequent position fix. For example, if three position fixes (p1, p2, and p3) are taken over time, and the distance between p1 and p2 plus the distance between p2 and p3 is greater than the distance between p1 and p3, the system can determine that p2 is an outlier. Alternatively, if the three position fixes all indicate that the asset is traveling in one direction (e.g., north), but p2 is in the opposite direction from p1 (e.g., south), and p3 is far enough away from p1 that the asset could not have traveled south between p1 and p2, and then north to get to p3, the system can determine that p2 is an outlier.

In other implementations, the system determines that a position fix is an outlier based on contextual data regarding shipment of the asset. For example, when the position fix corresponds to an asset entering or leaving a geofenced area, the system can compare the time of the position fix to data about when the asset was supposed to enter or leave the geofenced area. The system can determine the time the asset was supposed to enter or leave the geofenced area, for example, from one or more of the contextual parameters for the position fix. Alternatively, or additionally, the system can compare the position indicated by the position fix to the position of the conveyance on which the tag is supposed to travel. If the position indicated by the position fix does not match up with contextual information, the position fix can be determined to be an outlier.

The system modifies the position fix in accordance with a type of the event (606). In general, the system uses business logic appropriate for the type of event to determine how the position fix should be modified.

In some implementations, the event is a process event indicating a given shipping event has occurred. In these implementations, the system applies business logic that says that shipment events of the same type as the given shipping event frequently occur at a valid location. Valid locations can be, for example, locations that the system knows should be associated with shipment events of the given type. For example, begin and end journey events should always occur at valid origin or destination locations. Therefore, if the position fix is close enough to a valid origin or destination location (depending on whether the process event indicates the beginning or end of the journey) for the shipment, then that is likely where the asset actually is. To carry out this logic, the system tries to identify a valid origin or destination location within a threshold radius (e.g., 100 meters) from the position indicated by the position fix. The threshold can be determined, for example, based on the error range of position fixes. For example, the threshold can be determined empirically by measuring the worst outlier in position fixes for Tags during field trials. The origin or destination location can be identified, for example, from a geofence associated with the location. In some implementations, the valid origin or destination location is an origin or destination location associated with the specific asset being tracked. In other implementations, when the specific origin or destination location for the spe-

cific asset is not in range, the system can instead use any valid origin or destination location associated with the user (e.g., any origin location used by the user or any destination location used by the user). Similar valid locations can be identified for other events. For example, customs inspections should always occur within a known region in a port or terminal. Therefore, for a customs inspection event, the system can attempt to identify a valid customs location within range of the position fix. Other techniques for identifying a valid location can also be used, for example, selecting the closest valid location to the position fix. If the system does identify a valid location, the system then modifies the position fix to be the valid location.

In some implementations, the event is a security event (e.g., indicating that the asset has potentially been compromised). In these implementations, the system applies business logic that says that security events often occur at an asset's destination location (e.g., because the asset is opened when it arrives at its final destination). To carry out this logic, the system tries to identify a valid destination location within a threshold radius (e.g., 100 meters) from the position indicated by the position fix. If there is a valid destination location within the radius, the system modifies the position fix to indicate a location of the destination location. In some implementations, the system may also confirm that the time of the security event is close to an arrival time specified in contextual data for the shipment. In some implementations, the system alternatively, or additionally, applies business logic that says that security events often occur when an asset is being inspected by customs. Based on contextual information for the shipment (e.g., that the asset arrived in a port and has not left the port, and optionally has not been loaded onto a conveyance), the system can determine that the security event likely occurred in customs and correct the position fix to indicate the designated customs area inside the port.

In some implementations, the event is an environmental event (e.g., indicating that an environmental condition of the container is no longer in an acceptable range). In these implementations, the system applies business logic that says that the exact location of the environmental event is not critical, and therefore the system can use the location of the last position fix that satisfies the threshold for environmental events. The system modifies the position fix data accordingly.

In some implementations, the event is a tracking event (e.g., indicating a position of the asset). In these implementations, the system applies business logic that says that using multiple position fixes over time leads to a more accurate position fix than a single position fix. The system therefore combines a number of past position fixes (e.g., the past five fixes, or all fixes received in the last two hours), and modifies the position fix to be the average. For example, the system can average the position fixes, take a weighted average of the position fixes, take the median of the position fixes, apply the central limit theorem to the position fixes, interpolate a position fix from the position fixes, or extrapolate a position fix from the position fixes. When calculating a weighted average, the system can weight the position fixes, for example, by their deviation from the average, median, or mode fix. When interpolating a position fix, the system can estimate what an outlier position fix should be based on preceding and succeeding position fixes, and optionally the speed of the asset at each position fix. When extrapolating a position fix, the system can estimate what an outlier position fix should be based on preceding position fixes and the speed of the asset at those position fixes.

In some implementations, the business logic corresponding to the various events does not lead to the selection of an

11

updated location for the position fix. In these implementations, the system can apply one or more default procedures. In some implementations, the system can use dead reckoning to estimate the current location of the asset. Dead reckoning can include using one or more last received position fixes for the asset, an estimated speed of the asset, and the time between fixes to estimate the next position for the asset. Dead reckoning can also include projecting a path for the asset, for example, using a Rayleigh distribution, as described above, and then selecting an appropriate location on the path (or a location within a threshold radius of the appropriate location on the path). In other implementations, the system uses dead reckoning and then selects a valid location for the event (e.g., a origin location for a process event or a destination location for a security event) that is closest to the dead reckoning location.

Alternatively, the system can combine a number of past position fixes, for example, as described above with reference to tracking events. In some implementations, for events that are deemed less critical (e.g., tracking events), the system may ignore the position fix and not make any further attempts to use or modify the position fix; alternatively, the system may use the last known valid location for the asset, instead of the inaccurate position fix.

In some implementations, the system generates a notification identifying the asset, the event, and the modified position fix, and provides the notification to a user. The notification can optionally identify that the position fix has been modified. When the system includes the event server, the event server can provide the notification to the user, for example, by sorting or sequencing reports received from Tags and forwarding them to a tracking application operated by an information service (e.g., the information service 104). The event server can also format the reports to comply with processing logic of the tracking application. When the system includes just a Tag, the Tag can provide the notification to the user, for example, by forwarding the notification to the event server. The event server will then forward the notification on to the tracking service of the information service.

The features described above can be implemented in digital electronic circuitry, or in computer hardware, firmware, software, or in combinations of them. The features can be implemented in a computer program product tangibly embodied in a computer readable medium, e.g., in a machine-readable storage device, for execution by a programmable processor; and method steps can be performed by a programmable processor executing a program of instructions to perform functions of the described implementations by operating on input data and generating output.

The described features can be implemented advantageously in one or more computer programs that are executable on a programmable system including at least one programmable processor coupled to receive data and instructions from, and to transmit data and instructions to, a data storage system, at least one input device, and at least one output device. A computer program is a set of instructions that can be used, directly or indirectly, in a computer to perform a certain activity or bring about a certain result. A computer program can be written in any form of programming language (e.g., Objective-C, Java), including compiled or interpreted languages, and it can be deployed in any form, including as a stand-alone program or as a module, component, subroutine, or other unit suitable for use in a computing environment.

Suitable processors for the execution of a program of instructions include, by way of example, both general and special purpose microprocessors, and the sole processor or one of multiple processors or cores, of any kind of computer.

12

Generally, a processor will receive instructions and data from a read-only memory or a random access memory or both. The essential elements of a computer are a processor for executing instructions and one or more memories for storing instructions and data. Generally, a computer will also include, or be operatively coupled to communicate with, one or more mass storage devices for storing data files; such devices include magnetic disks, such as internal hard disks and removable disks; magneto-optical disks; and optical disks. Storage devices suitable for tangibly embodying computer program instructions and data include all forms of non-volatile memory, including by way of example semiconductor memory devices, such as EPROM, EEPROM, and flash memory devices; magnetic disks such as internal hard disks and removable disks; magneto-optical disks; and CD-ROM and DVD-ROM disks. The processor and the memory can be supplemented by, or incorporated in, ASICs (application-specific integrated circuits).

To provide for interaction with a user, the features can be implemented on a computer having a display device such as a CRT (cathode ray tube) or LCD (liquid crystal display) monitor for displaying information to the user and a keyboard and a pointing device such as a mouse or a trackball by which the user can provide input to the computer.

The features can be implemented in a computer system that includes a back-end component, such as a data server, or that includes a middleware component, such as an application server or an Internet server, or that includes a front-end component, such as a client computer having a graphical user interface or an Internet browser, or any combination of them. The components of the system can be connected by any form or medium of digital data communication such as a communication network. Examples of communication networks include, e.g., a LAN, a WAN, and the computers and networks forming the Internet.

The computer system can include clients and servers. A client and server are generally remote from each other and typically interact through a network. The relationship of client and server arises by virtue of computer programs running on the respective computers and having a client-server relationship to each other.

A number of implementations have been described. Nevertheless, it will be understood that various modifications may be made. For example, elements of one or more implementations may be combined, deleted, modified, or supplemented to form further implementations. As yet another example, the logic flows depicted in the figures do not require the particular order shown, or sequential order, to achieve desirable results. In addition, other steps may be provided, or steps may be eliminated, from the described flows, and other components may be added to, or removed from, the described systems. Accordingly, other implementations are within the scope of the following claims.

What is claimed is:

1. A computer-implemented method, comprising:
 - receiving, at a computing device, a first position fix for an asset, the first position fix corresponding to a first location of the asset determined when an event of a pre-defined event type occurred during shipment of the asset;
 - determining, by the computing device, if the first position fix is inaccurate by comparing the first location to a second location where the event was expected to occur; and
 - if the first position fix is inaccurate, determining if the expected location of the event is within a threshold distance of the first position fix; and

13

modifying, by the computing device, the first position fix to correspond to the expected location of the first event when the expected location is within a threshold distance of the first position fix.

2. The method of claim 1, further comprising:
generating a notification identifying the asset, the event, and the modified first position fix; and
providing the notification to a user.

3. The method of claim 1, wherein modifying the first position fix comprises:
determining that the type of the first event is a shipping event;
identifying the expected location, the expected location being a valid location for the shipping event; and
modifying the first position fix to indicate the expected location.

4. The method of claim 3, wherein the shipping event is that the shipment is beginning, and identifying the expected location comprises:
determining whether a valid origin location for the shipment is within a threshold distance of the first position fix; and
identifying the valid origin location as the valid location if the valid origin location is within a threshold distance of the first position fix, and otherwise identifying an origin location associated with a sender of the shipment.

5. The method of claim 3, wherein the shipping event is that the shipment is ending, and identifying the expected location comprises:
determining whether a valid destination location for the shipment is within a threshold distance of the first position fix; and
identifying the valid destination location as the valid location if the valid destination location is within a threshold distance of the first position fix, and otherwise identifying a destination location associated with a receiver of the shipment.

6. The method of claim 1, wherein modifying the first position fix comprises:
determining that the type of the first event is an environmental event indicating that an environmental requirement for the asset has been violated; and
modifying the first position fix to be a last received position fix having an accuracy score that satisfies the threshold value for events having the type environmental event.

7. A system, comprising:
a tag configured to perform operations comprising:
receiving position fix data for an asset; and
generating notifications identifying position fixes for events during shipment of the asset;
one or more servers configured to perform operations comprising:
receiving a first position fix for the asset from the tag, the first position fix corresponding to a first location of the asset determined when a first event of a predefined event type occurred during shipment of the asset;
determining if the first position fix is inaccurate by comparing the first location to a second location where the event was expected to occur; and
if the first position fix is inaccurate, determining if the expected location of the event is within a threshold distance of the first position fix; and
modifying the first position fix to correspond to the expected location of the first event when the expected location is within a threshold distance of the first position fix.

14

8. The system of claim 7, wherein modifying the first position fix comprises:
determining that the type of the first event is a shipping event;
identifying the expected location, the expected location being a valid location for the shipping event; and
modifying the first position fix to indicate the expected location.

9. The system of claim 8, wherein the shipping event is that the shipment is beginning, and identifying the expected location comprises:
determining whether a valid origin location for the shipment is within a threshold distance of the first position fix; and
identifying the valid origin location as the valid location if the valid origin location is within a threshold distance of the first position fix, and otherwise identifying an origin location associated with a sender of the shipment.

10. The system of claim 8, wherein the shipping event is that the shipment is ending, and identifying the expected location comprises:
determining whether a valid destination location for the shipment is within a threshold distance of the first position fix; and
identifying the valid destination location as the valid location if the valid destination location is within a threshold distance of the first position fix, and otherwise identifying a destination location associated with a receiver of the shipment.

11. A system, comprising:
a tag configured to perform operations comprising:
receiving position fix data for an asset; and
generating notifications identifying position fixes for events during shipment of the asset;
one or more servers configured to perform operations comprising:
receiving a first position fix for the asset from the tag, the first position fix corresponding to a first location of the asset determined when a first event of a predefined event type occurred during shipment of the asset;
determining if the first position fix is inaccurate by comparing the first location to a second location where the event was expected to occur; and
if the first position fix is inaccurate, modifying the first position fix to correspond to the expected location of the first event, wherein modifying the first position fix comprises:
determining that the type of the first event is an environmental event indicating that an environmental requirement for the asset has been violated; and
modifying the first position fix to be a last received position fix having an accuracy score that satisfies the threshold value for events having the type environmental event.

12. The system of claim 7, wherein modifying the first position fix comprises:
determining that the type of the first event is a security event indicating that the asset has been compromised;
determining that the first location is within a threshold distance of a destination location for the asset; and
modifying the first position fix to be the destination location for the asset.

13. A system, comprising:
a tag configured to perform operations comprising:
receiving position fix data for an asset; and
generating notifications identifying position fixes for events during shipment of the asset;

15

one or more servers configured to perform operations comprising:

receiving a first position fix for the asset from the tag, the first position fix corresponding to a first location of the asset determined when a first event of a predefined event type occurred during shipment of the asset; 5
determining if the first position fix is inaccurate by comparing the first location to a second location where the event was expected to occur; and
if the first position fix is inaccurate, modifying the first position fix to correspond to the expected location of the first event, wherein modifying the first position fix comprises: 10
determining that the type of the first event is a security event indicating that the asset has been compromised; 15
determining that the first location is within a threshold distance of a customs inspection location; and
modifying the first position fix to be the customs inspection location.

14. The method of claim 1, wherein modifying the first position fix comprises: 20
determining that the type of the first event is a security event indicating that the asset has been compromised;
determining that the first location is within a threshold distance of a destination location for the asset; and

16

modifying the first position fix to be the destination location for the asset.

15. A computer-implemented method, comprising:
receiving, at a computing device, a first position fix for an asset, the first position fix corresponding to a first location of the asset determined when an event of a predefined event type occurred during shipment of the asset;
determining, by the computing device, if the first position fix is inaccurate by comparing the first location to a second location where the event was expected to occur; and
if the first position fix is inaccurate, modifying, by the computing device, the first position fix to correspond and to the expected location of the first event, wherein modifying the first position fix comprises:
determining that the type of the first event is a security event indicating that the asset has been compromised;
determining that the first location is within a threshold distance of a customs inspection location; and
modifying the first position fix to be the customs inspection location.

* * * * *

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION

PATENT NO. : 8,432,274 B2
APPLICATION NO. : 12/533913
DATED : April 30, 2013
INVENTOR(S) : Nicholas D. Cova and Narayana C. Krishna

Page 1 of 1

It is certified that error appears in the above-identified patent and that said Letters Patent is hereby corrected as shown below:

In the Claims

Column 16, Line 16 at Claim 15; replace:

“and to the expected location of the first event, wherein” with
-- to the expected location of the first event, wherein --

Signed and Sealed this
Twentieth Day of August, 2013



Teresa Stanek Rea
Acting Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office

31