

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COPELAND COMFORT CONTROL LP,
Petitioner,

v.

OLLNOVA TECHNOLOGIES LTD.,
Patent Owner

IPR2023-00624
Patent No. 8,224,282

**DECLARATION OF ERIK DE LA IGLESIA IN SUPPORT OF PATENT
OWNER'S RESPONSE**

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the following
declaration is true and correct.

Executed this 29th day of December, 2023, in Mountain View, California.



ERIK DE LA IGLESIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS.....	2
III.	LEGAL PRINCIPLES.....	4
	A. Claim construction.....	4
	B. Burden of Proof	4
	C. Anticipation	5
	D. Obviousness	5
IV.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	7
V.	ASSERTED REFERENCES.....	7
VI.	'282 PATENT	8
VII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	10
VIII.	GROUND 1, 3, 5 AND 7 – MCFARLAND, ALONE OR IN COMBINATION, DOES NOT DISCLOSE OR TEACH LIMITATIONS OF CHALLENGED CLAIMS 1-5, 7-11 AND 20- 21.....	12
	A. McFarland does not disclose or teach “a multi-sensor package” as recited in claims 1, 7 and 20.....	13
	B. McFarland does not disclose or teach “receive sensor control information related to sensor data in control” as recited in claim 1.	14
	C. McFarland does not disclose or teach “a second automation component in communication with the building automation system” as recited in claims 1, 7, or 20.	15
	D. Ahmed-629 in combination with McFarland does not teach or suggest “a multi-sensor package” as recited in claims 1, 7 and 20.....	16

IX.	GROUNDS 2, 4, 6, AND 8 – MCFARLAND, IN COMBINATION WITH EITHER KATES-089, STONER AND KATES-089, KATES-089 AND AHMED-629, OR STONER, KATES-089 AND AHMED-629, DOES NOT DISCLOSE OR TEACH LIMITATIONS OF CHALLENGED CLAIMS 13-16.....	17
X.	GROUND 9 – AHMED-629 IN COMBINATION WITH KATES- 089 DOES NOT TEACH OR SUGGEST “A MULTI-SENSOR PACKAGE” AS RECITED IN CLAIM 20 (AND DEPENDENT CLAIM 21).....	18
	CHALLENGED CLAIMS	19

I, Erik de la Iglesia, hereby declare as follows:

I. Introduction

1. I am over the age of eighteen (18) years and otherwise competent to make this declaration.

2. I have been retained as an expert witness on behalf of Ollnova Technologies Ltd. (“Ollnova”) for the above-captioned *inter partes* review (“IPR”). I understand that the petition for *inter partes* review involves U.S. Patent No. 8,224,28 (“the ’282 Patent”). I have previously offered a declaration regarding claim construction in the related district court case, *see* Ex. 1043, and provided an expert report and testimony in *Ollnova Technologies Ltd. v. ecobee Technologies ULC d/b/a ecobee*, Case No. 2:22-cv-00072-JRG in the Eastern District of Texas, regarding the operation, including source code operation, of ecobee devices accused of infringing the ’282 Patent.

3. I make this declaration based on my personal knowledge, educational background and training, consideration of the materials I discuss herein, and my expert opinions.

4. I am being compensated at a rate of \$650 per hour for my time in this matter. My compensation does not depend on the outcome of this proceeding, and I have no financial interest in its outcome.

5. I have been asked to consider whether the claims of the '282 Patent would have been obvious based on certain prior art references. I have also been asked to consider the state of the art and prior art available as of March 18, 2009, the filing date of the non-provisional application for the '282 Patent. Based on the combination of prior art references discussed in the Petition and supporting declaration of Dr. Dean P. Neikirk (Ex. 1002), it is my opinion that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have found claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-16, , and 20-21 of the '282 Patent to have been obvious. My opinions are provided below.

6. In preparing this Declaration, I have reviewed and considered the '282 Patent (Ex. 1001), the '282 Patent's prosecution history (Ex. 1003), the Petition, the declaration and cited material of Dean P. Neikirk (Ex. 1002) submitted in this proceeding in support of the Petition, and each document cited in my declaration.

II. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS

7. My qualifications for forming the opinions given in this declaration are summarized here and are addressed more fully in my curriculum vitae, which is submitted as Exhibit 2009. That exhibit also includes a list of my publications.

8. I hold a Master of Science degree in Electrical Engineering from Stanford University and a Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering from the University of Florida. I have been associated with computer architecture, computer memory, computer storage mediums including flash and the electronics

industry in general as a designer, architect and consultant for approximately twenty-five (25) years.

9. My skills and experience are in the fields of Computer Architecture, Networks, Memory and IO Systems, Security and Content Management, Storage Protocols and Appliances, Storage Systems, Flash Devices and related areas. Beginning in 1997, I worked as a design engineer within the Mobile and Handheld Products Group at Intel. Since 2003, I have held director, chief architect and founder roles at private and public companies in fields such as computer networking, security and storage. I have also served as a technical advisor to startups in certain fields of cloud technology.

10. My industry work in these fields has resulted in 68 issued US patents that have been cited over 2,850 times in USPTO-issued patents and as prior art in PTAB proceedings and I have both design and management experience relevant to the fields of integrated hardware and software design for networked system components relevant to this matter.

11. Since 2014 I have served as a legal consultant / expert witness on over 50 legal matters related to infringement, validity, trade secrets and other aspects and have testified in District Court and before the International Trade Commission. Because of my background, training, and experience, I am qualified as an expert to opine on the subject matter of this declaration. A more detailed account of my

work experience and other qualifications is listed in my Curriculum Vitae (Ex. 2009).

III. LEGAL PRINCIPLES

A. Claim construction

12. I understand that the first step in performing a validity analysis of the patent claims is to interpret the meaning and scope of the claims by construing the terms and phrases found in those claims. I understand that the appropriate construction of a claim term is its ordinary and accustomed meaning as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in the context of the entire patent.

13. I understand that standard for claim construction in an *inter partes* review is the same standard as is applied in district court proceedings.

14. I understand that a determination of the meaning and scope of the claims is a matter of law. I have been informed that to determine the meaning of the claims, one should consider the intrinsic evidence, which includes the patent's claims, written description, and prosecution history.

B. Burden of Proof

15. I understand that in an *inter partes* review, the petitioner has the burden of proving unpatentability by a preponderance of the evidence.

C. Anticipation

16. I have been instructed by counsel and understand that a reference is anticipated if a single prior art reference discloses each and every claim element, either explicitly or inherently, as arranged in the same way as in the claim. I understand that where even one claim element is not disclosed in a reference, a contention of anticipation fails.

17. I further understand that when a reference fails to explicitly disclose a claim element, that reference inherently discloses that element only if the reference must *necessarily* include the undisclosed claim element.

D. Obviousness

18. I have been instructed by counsel and understand that a combination of prior art references may render a claim obvious if, at the time of the invention, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have selected and combined those prior-art elements in the normal course of research and development to yield the claimed invention.

19. I understand that in an obviousness analysis, one should consider the *Graham* factors: the scope and content of the prior art; the differences between the claimed inventions and the prior art; the level of ordinary skill in the art; and certain secondary considerations, identified below. I further understand the obviousness analysis is to be performed on a claim-by-claim basis. I understand

that a person of ordinary skill in the art is a person of ordinary creativity, not an automaton.

20. I have been instructed by counsel and understand that obviousness requires more than a mere showing that the prior art includes separate references covering each separate limitation in a claim under examination. I understand obviousness requires the additional showing that a person of ordinary skill at the time of the invention would have been *motivated* to combine those references in a manner that would include all limitations of the challenged claim, and, in making that combination, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a *reasonable expectation of success*.

21. I also understand that an obviousness analysis must be conducted with awareness of the distortion caused by hindsight bias and with caution of arguments reliant upon *ex post* reasoning. For instance, I understand that when considering obviousness, I should put myself in the position of a person of ordinary skill in the field at the time of the invention, rather than considering new information that is known today but was not known before the priority date of the challenged patent.

22. In particular, I understand that it is improper to use the challenged patent's disclosure or invention as a roadmap to find its prior-art components, because such an approach discounts the value of combining various existing features or principles in a new way to achieve a new result.

IV. Person of ordinary skill in the art

23. In his declaration, Dr. Neikirk states that a person of ordinary skill in the art “would have had a minimum of a bachelor’s degree in electrical engineering, or a related field, along with at least two years of professional experience in sensors, controls, and/or wireless communications. Additional graduate education could substitute for professional experience, or significant experience in the field could substitute for formal education.” Ex. 1002 at ¶ 46. For purposes of this declaration, I apply this level of skill in the art as I did in the declaration I submitted with respect to claim construction in the related district court case (Ex. 1043). I further note that, as of the non-provisional filing date of the ’282 Patent, March 18, 2009, I was at least at this level of skill.

V. Asserted References

24. The Petition and Dr. Neikirk’s declaration rely on the following references: (1) U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0242688 (“McFarland”), (2) U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0071089 (“Kates-089”), (3) U.S. Patent No. 8,276,829 (“Stoner”), and (4) U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0268629 (“Ahmed-629”).

25. The Petition and Dr. Neikirk’s declaration assert the following grounds for invalidity:

Grounds		Claims	Prior Art
1	§102/§103	1-5, 7-11, 20-21	McFarland
2	§103	13-16	McFarland in view of Kates-089
3		1-5, 7-11, 20-21	McFarland in view of Stoner
4		13-16	McFarland in view of Stoner and Kates-089
5		1-5, 7-11, 20-21	McFarland in view of Ahmed-629
6		13-16	McFarland in view of Kates-089 and Ahmed- 629
7		1-5, 7-11, 20-21	McFarland in view of Stoner and Ahmed-629
8		13-16	McFarland in view of Stoner, Kates-089, and Ahmed-629
9		20-21	Kates-089 in view of Ahmed-629

26. For the claim limitations of the '282 Patent that I address in this declaration, the Petition and Dr. Neikirk's declaration only rely on McFarland, Kates-089 and Ahmed-629 as references that teach the addressed limitations. Consequently, I restrict my analysis in this declaration to these three references. I have included a listing of the challenged claims at the end of my declaration.

VI. '282 Patent

27. The '282 Patent is directed to a system with automation components that may "include[]" a multi-sensor package, a wireless communications component, a processor in communication with the wireless communications

component and the sensor package, and a memory in communication with the processor.” Ex. 1001, 2:31-35. A POSITA reading the disclosure of the ’282 Patent would understand that an automation component may be within a building automation system (BAS), *id.*, 2:29-31, or it may be in communication with the building automation system. *Id.*, 2:40-41, 55-57. “Wireless communication between [the] individual ... automation components 112, 116 and/or the subnets 118a, 118b may be conducted in a direct or point-to-point manner, or in an indirect or routed manner through the nodes or devices comprising the nodes or networks 102, 108, 114 and 118.” *Id.*, 5:44-49.

28. “The automation component 200 may be a multi-sensor wireless device that includes a sensor package 220 in communication with the sub-components 202, 204 and 210 via the communication bus 218. The sensor package 220 may be configured to sense or detect a variety of variables such as, for example, temperature, humidity, carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, etc.” *Id.*, 6:22-28.

29. The ’282 Patent teaches that “the exemplary multi-sensor automation component 200 scans each of the sensors operating within the sensor package 220,” *id.*, 8:65-67, and “a receiving device such as, for example, the field panel 120 may communicate sensor usage or control information to the automation

component that identifies which sensor and sensor data is currently being analyzed and/or is primary or controlling the field panel 120.” *Id.*, 9:9-13.

30. The ’282 Patent claims are generally directed to multi-sensor packages and a POSITA reading the disclosure of the ’282 Patent would understand that it is necessary to indicate which of the available sensors is in control, *i.e.*, sensor data in control. “In other words, during any given scan cycle, one of the sensor values and/or a corresponding sensor control routine is executed by the receiving device (e.g., the field panel 120). The communicated sensor control information provided by the receiving device identifies for the automation component 200 which sensor and/or sensor value is driving or controlling the receiving device during the scan cycle.” *Id.*, 9:16-22.

VII. Claim Construction

31. A POSITA reading the disclosure of the ’282 Patent and its prosecution history would understand that the claim term “a multi-sensor package,” that appears in claims 1, 7, 13, and 20 of the ’282 Patent means a single packaged sensor device with multiple operable sensors.

32. The ’282 Patent specification discloses that “[t]he sensor package 220 may be configured to sense or detect a variety of variables such as, for example, temperature, humidity, carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, etc.” Ex. 1001, 6:25-28. A POSITA reading the disclosure of the

'282 Patent would understand that it is directed to multiple operating sensors within the sensor package. A POSITA would understand this because, *inter alia*, the specification discloses that “some of the sensors within the sensor package 220 may require a great deal of power to operate. In order to increase the life of the battery 222, the high power requirement sensors within the sensor package 220 may be configured to operate periodically or on a set schedule.” *Id.*, 6:47-51. A POSITA would also understand this because, in relation to a power saving communication algorithm for the automation component, the specification teaches that “the exemplary multi-sensor automation component 200 scans each of the sensors operating within the sensor package 220,” *id.*, 8:65-67, and “a receiving device such as, for example, the field panel 120 may communicate sensor usage or control information to the automation component that identifies which sensor and sensor data is currently being analyzed and/or is primary or controlling the field panel 120.” *Id.*, 9:9-13. A POSITA’s understanding of this would be further reinforced by considering the alternate power saving communication algorithm disclosed in the '282 Patent in which “the exemplary multi-sensor automation component 200 scans each of the sensors operating within the sensor package 220...” *Id.*, 9:43-46.

33. A POSITA reading the disclosure of the '282 Patent and its prosecution history would understand that the claim term “receive sensor control

information related to sensor data in control” means to receive information that identifies which sensor or sensor value is driving or controlling a receiving device in communication with the building automation system.

34. As discussed above, a POSITA reading the disclosure of the '282 Patent would understand that it may be necessary to indicate which of the available sensors is in control when communicating with an automation component, *i.e.*, which sensor data is in control. Ex. 1001, 9:10-22.

35. A POSITA reading the disclosure of the '282 Patent would understand that an automation component can be a device that is not within the building automation system and wirelessly communicates using direct, indirect or routed wireless communications because “wireless communication between individual ... automation components 112, 116 and/or the subnets 118 *a*, 118 *b* may be conducted in a direct or point-to-point manner, or in an indirect or routed manner through the nodes or devices comprising the nodes or networks 102, 108, 114 and 118.” *Id.*, 5:44-49.

VIII. Grounds 1, 3, 5 and 7 – McFarland, alone or in combination, does not disclose or teach limitations of challenged claims 1-5, 7-11 and 20-21.

36. In evaluating the claims, I have applied the plain and ordinary meaning of the claim terms to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

A. **McFarland does not disclose or teach “a multi-sensor package” as recited in claims 1, 7 and 20.**

37. The Petition and Dr. Neikirk assert that McFarland discloses claim elements [1.a], “a multi-sensor package configured to detect a plurality of variables and generate sensor data for each detected variable,” [7.a], “a multi-sensor package configured to generate a plurality of sensor data for each sensor within the multi-sensor package,” and [20.a], “scanning sensor data associated with each of a plurality of sensors contained within a multi-sensor package.” *See* Petition at 18-22, 35, and 42; Neikirk Dec. at ¶¶70-74, 106-107, and 129-131. Because McFarland does not disclose the claimed “multi-sensor package” it is my opinion that it fails to satisfy these claim limitations of the ’282 Patent as the Petition and Dr. Neikirk have asserted.

38. McFarland describes the operation of its disclosed devices in the context of a single operational sensor. “A sensing device monitors a condition and/or status of **an** event. The sensing device may report appropriate sensor information, such as a current value or indicator of the condition, timing of a reading, prior measurements, status of the sensor and/or a comparison of a measured value to a desired limit, range or a previous measurement.” Ex. 1027, [0023] (emphasis added). For example, McFarland states that “[t]he automation

device 207 may be a sensor that monitors a condition and/or event, such as a building environment.” *Id.*, [0037] (emphasis added).

39. McFarland does not disclose a single packaged sensor device with multiple operable sensors. A POSITA would understand that McFarland’s teachings of “a collection of devices” or “a micro-electromechanical sensors (‘MEMS’) or larger sensors,” *id.*, [0043], does not disclose a single packaged sensor device with multiple operable sensors. A collection of devices is not a single packaged sensor device. There is no teaching in McFarland of receiving or processing signals from multiple operating sensors in a single packaged sensor device.

B. McFarland does not disclose or teach “receive sensor control information related to sensor data in control” as recited in claim 1.

40. The Petition and Dr. Neikirk assert that McFarland discloses the limitation appearing in claim element [1.e], “wherein the computer readable instructions are programmed to: receive sensor control information related to sensor data in control at a second automation component in communication with the building automation system; and” Petition at 25-29; Neikirk Dec. at ¶¶84-88. Because McFarland does not disclose the claimed “sensor control information related to sensor data in control” it is my opinion that it fails to satisfy this claim limitation of the ’282 Patent as the Petition and Dr. Neikirk have asserted.

41. A POSITA would understand that the sensor control information claimed in the '282 Patent is information identifying which one of a plurality of sensors and/or sensor values from the multi-sensor package is driving or controlling the receiving device. In the '282 Patent, “[t]he communicated sensor control information provided by the receiving device identifies for the automation component 200 which sensor and/or sensor value is driving or controlling the receiving device during the scan cycle.” Ex. 1001, 9:17-22.

C. **McFarland does not disclose or teach “a second automation component in communication with the building automation system” as recited in claims 1, 7, or 20.**

42. The Petition and Dr. Neikirk assert that McFarland discloses the limitations appearing in claim elements [1.e] (“a second automation component in communication with the building automation system”), [7.e] (“a second automation component in communication with the building automation system”), and [20.c] (“a second automation component in communication with the first automation component and the building automation system.”). Petition at 25-29; 35-36; 42-43; Neikirk Dec. at ¶¶87-88; 108-110; 135-137. Because McFarland does not disclose a second automation component that is not within the building automation system but is nevertheless communicating with the building automation system, it is my opinion that McFarland fails to satisfy these claim limitations of the '282 Patent as the Petition and Dr. Neikirk have asserted.

43. A POSITA would understand that McFarland discloses communications between and among controllers, sensors and actuators within a building automation system. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 1027, [0022] (“That is, the communication of information between and among devices includes transmitting, routing, and/or information hopping using low-power wireless RF communications across a network defined by the devices.”). *See also Id.*, Fig. 1. A POSITA would understand that McFarland does not disclose communicating with an automation device that is not within the building automation system.

D. Ahmed-629 in combination with McFarland does not teach or suggest “a multi-sensor package” as recited in claims 1, 7 and 20.

44. The Petition and Dr. Neikirk assert that McFarland in combination with Ahmed-629 teaches claim elements [1.a], “a multi-sensor package configured to detect a plurality of variables and generate sensor data for each detected variable,” [7.a], “a multi-sensor package configured to generate a plurality of sensor data for each sensor within the multi-sensor package,” and [20.a], “scanning sensor data associated with each of a plurality of sensors contained within a multi-sensor package.” *See* Petition at 69-72; Neikirk Dec. at ¶¶200-204. Because neither McFarland nor Ahmed-629 discloses, teaches or suggests the claimed “multi-sensor package,” it is my opinion that these references fail to satisfy these claim limitations of the ’282 Patent as the Petition and Dr. Neikirk have asserted.

45. Ahmed-629 does not disclose a single packaged sensor device with multiple operable sensors. In the disclosure of Ahmed-629, each sensor module is used for a specific purpose that is defined by the configuration information. “The programmable non-volatile memory 38, which may be embodied as a flash programmable EEPROM, stores configuration information for the sensor module 28.” Ex. 1036, [0051]. “The memory 38 further includes set-up configuration information related to the type of sensor or sensors being used.” *Id.*, [0052].

46. In Ahmed-629, only one sensor functionality is enabled in a particular sensor module. *Id.* (“if the sensor suite 42 is implemented as a number of sensor devices, the memory 38 includes the information that identifies which sensor functionality to enable.”). *See also Id.*, [0056] (“The sensor module 28 may be programmed upon shipment from the factory, or upon installation into the building control system. The microcontroller 36, responsive to the configuration information, causes the signal processing circuit 40 to process signals only from the temperature sensor, ignoring output from other sensors of the sensor suite 42.”).

IX. Grounds 2, 4, 6, and 8 – McFarland, in combination with either Kates-089, Stoner and Kates-089, Kates-089 and Ahmed-629, or Stoner, Kates-089 and Ahmed-629, does not disclose or teach limitations of challenged claims 13-16.

47. Neither the Petition nor Dr. Neikerk provide separate arguments for claim limitation [13.a] “a multi-sensor package configured to detect a plurality of variables and generate sensor data for each detected variable.” Petition at 49; Neikirk Dec. at ¶¶152.

48. McFarland does not disclose, teach or suggest this claim limitation for the same reasons it fails to disclose, teach or suggest the corresponding claim limitations in [1.a], [7.a], or [20.a].

49. McFarland and Ahmed-629 do not disclose, teach or suggest this claim limitation for the same reasons they fail to disclose, teach or suggest the corresponding claim limitations in [1.a], [7.a], or [20.a] as set forth above in paragraphs 45-46 of this Declaration.

X. Ground 9 – Ahmed-629 in combination with Kates-089 does not teach or suggest “a multi-sensor package” as recited in claim 20 (and dependent claim 21).

50. The Petition and Dr. Neikirk assert that Kates-089 in combination with Ahmed-629 teaches claim element [20.a], “scanning sensor data associated with each of a plurality of sensors contained within a multi-sensor package.” *See* Petition at 72-74; Neikirk Dec. at ¶¶205-213. Because neither Kates-089 nor Ahmed-629 discloses, teaches or suggests the claimed “multi-sensor package,” it is my opinion that these references fail to satisfy this claim limitations of the ’282

Patent as the Petition and Dr. Neikirk have asserted for the reasons set forth above in paragraphs 45-46 of this Declaration.

CHALLENGED CLAIMS

Claim	Text
[1.pre]	An automation component configured for wireless communication within a building automation system, the automation component comprising:
[1.a]	a multi-sensor package configured to detect a plurality of variables and generate sensor data for each detected variable;
[1.b]	a wireless communications component;
[1.c]	a processor in communication with the wireless communications component and the sensor package;
[1.d]	a memory in communication with the processor, the memory configured to store sensor data provided by the sensor package and computer readable instructions which are executable by the processor;
[1.e]	wherein the computer readable instructions are programmed to: receive sensor control information related to sensor data in control at a second automation component in communication with the building automation system; and
[1.f]	communicate a portion of the stored sensor data corresponding to the received sensor control information to the second automation component.
[2]	The automation component of claim 1, wherein the sensor package includes one or more sensors selected from the group consisting of a temperature sensor, a humidity sensor; a carbon monoxide sensor; a carbon dioxide sensor and a volatile organic compound sensor.

Claim	Text
[3]	The automation component of claim 1, wherein the computer readable instructions are further programmed to: identify sensor values within the sensor data that exceed a corresponding change- of-value threshold.
[4]	The automation component of claim 1, wherein the computer readable instructions are further programmed to: set an identification flag for each identified sensor value.
[5]	The automation component of claim 1, wherein the computer readable instructions are further programmed to: communicate all of the stored sensor data corresponding to the received sensor control information to the second automation component.
[7.pre]	An automation component configured for wireless communication within a building automation system, the automation component comprising:
[7.a]	a multi-sensor package configured to generate a plurality of sensor data for each sensor within the multi-sensor package;
[7.b]	a wireless communications component;
[7.c]	a processor in communication with the wireless communications component and the sensor package;
[7.d]	a memory in communication with the processor, the memory configured to store sensor data provided by the sensor package and computer readable instructions which are executable by the processor;
[7.e]	wherein the computer readable instructions are programmed to: receive status data related to sensor data in control at a second automation component in communication with the building automation system;
[7.f]	determine the sensor data in control at the second automation component based on the received status data; and
[7.g]	communicate the stored sensor data corresponding the sensor data in control to the second automation component.

Claim	Text
[8]	The automation component of claim 7, wherein the sensor package includes one or more sensors selected from the group consisting of a temperature sensor, a humidity sensor; a carbon monoxide sensor; a carbon dioxide sensor and a volatile organic compound sensor.
[9]	The automation component of claim 7, wherein the computer readable instructions are further programmed to: identify sensor values within the sensor data that exceed a corresponding change- of-value threshold.
[10]	The automation component of claim 7, wherein the computer readable instructions are further programmed to: set an identification flag for each identified sensor value.
[11]	The automation component of claim 7, wherein the computer readable instructions are further programmed to: communicate all of the stored sensor data corresponding to the received status information to the second automation component.
[13.pre]	An automation component configured for wireless communication within a building automation system, the automation component comprising:
[13.a]	a multi-sensor package configured to detect a plurality of variables and generate sensor data for each detected variable;
[13.b]	a wireless communications component;
[13.c]	a processor in communication with the wireless communications component and the sensor package;
[13.d]	a memory in communication with the processor, the memory configured to store sensor data provided by the sensor package and computer readable instructions which are executable by the processor;
[13.e]	wherein the computer readable instructions are programmed to: receive a wake-up command from a second automation component;
[13.f]	communicate stored sensor data related to the sensor data in control at a second automation component; and

Claim	Text
[13.g]	receive a power-down command from the second automation component.
[14]	The automation component of claim 13, wherein the sensor package includes one or more sensors selected from the group consisting of a temperature sensor, a humidity sensor; a carbon monoxide sensor; a carbon dioxide sensor and a volatile organic compound sensor.
[15]	The automation component of claim 13, wherein the computer readable instructions are further programmed to: identify sensor values within the sensor data that exceed a corresponding change- of-value threshold.
[16]	The automation component of claim 13, wherein the computer readable instructions are further programmed to: set an identification flag for each identified sensor value.
[20.pre]	A method for providing power saving wireless communication within a building automation system, the method comprising:
[20.a]	scanning sensor data associated with each of a plurality of sensors contained within a multi-sensor package of a first automation component;
[20.b]	identifying changed sensor values within the sensor data;
[20.c]	receiving a first communication from a second automation component in communication with the first automation component and the building automation system; and
[20.d]	communicating a portion of the identified changed sensor values associated with the first communication received from the second automation component.
[21]	The method of claim 20, wherein identifying changed sensor values includes identifying changed sensor values as a function of a change-of-value threshold.