IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of: MAETA et al.   Art Unit: 2196

Application Number: 17/666,573   Examiner: Charles M SWIFT

Filed: February 8, 2022   Confirmation Number: 2226

For: APP MIGRATION SYSTEM AND INFORMATION STORAGE MEDIUM

Attorney Docket Number: **CY-0134**

Customer Number: 111375

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents   August 19, 2025
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Commissioner:

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

In response to the Office Action dated May 23, 2025, Applicant submits:

Amendments to the Claims begin on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks begin on page 9 of this paper.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the application:

Claim 1 (Currently Amended): An app migration system, comprising at least one processor configured to:

place a groupware app in one of an inside and an outside of a first virtual space joined by at least one user in a user group in which information is shareable;

wherein the app includes an actual data portion and wherein the actual data portion corresponds to the information exchanged within the app;

wherein the first virtual space is either a first public space, a first private space, or a first guest space, and wherein the first virtual space has a first permission setting;

set, for the app a first permission corresponding to a placement location of the app in the first virtual space corresponding to the first permission setting;

migrate the app from the first virtual space to a second virtual space in one of a route between a public space and a private space and a route between the inside and the outside of the space

wherein the second virtual space is either a second public space, a second private space or a second guest space, and wherein the second virtual space has a second permission setting which is different than the first permission setting;

set, for the migrated app, a second permission corresponding to a migration destination of the app in the second virtual space corresponding to the second permission setting.

Claim 2 (Original): The app migration system according to claim 1,

wherein the at least one processor is configured to set, for the app, a permission specific to the app, and

wherein the settings of the permission specific to the app are maintained even when the

app is migrated.

Claim 3 (Original): The app migration system according to claim 2, wherein the at least

one processor is configured to control access to the app based on a logical product of the

permission corresponding to the migration destination of the migrated app and the permission

specific to the app.

Claim 4 (Original): The app migration system according to claim 1,

wherein the app includes a plurality of apps, and

wherein the at least one processor is configured to:

set a permission common to the plurality of apps; and

control access to the app for which the permission has been set, based on a logical

product of the set permission and another permission.

Claim 5 (Original): The app migration system according to claim 1, wherein the at least

one processor is configured to:

determine whether a user instructing the migration of the app has an app management

permission and the user has an app creation permission at the migration destination of the app;

and

migrate the app based on a result of the determination.

Claim 6 (Original): The app migration system according to claim 5, wherein the at least

one processor is configured to further determine whether the user instructing the migration of the

app has a permission to manage the space, when a migration source of the app is in the inside of the space.

Claim 7 (Original): The app migration system according to claim 1, wherein the at least one processor is configured to restrict the migration of the app relating to the space which is set so that information to be shared therein is isolated.

Claim 8 (Original): The app migration system according to claim 1, wherein the at least one processor is configured to:

migrate the app when a predetermined condition is satisfied; and

notify a user instructing the migration of the app of a reason that the predetermined condition is not satisfied, when the predetermined condition is not satisfied.

Claim 9 (Original): The app migration system according to claim 1, wherein the at least one processor is configured to:

migrate the app when a predetermined condition is satisfied;

search for the space to which the app is allowed to be migrated based on the predetermined condition;

receive, from among results of the search, designation of the migration destination performed by the user instructing the migration of the app; and

migrate the app to the migration destination designated by the user.

Claim 10 (Original): The app migration system according to claim 1, wherein the at least one processor is configured to set the app as a search target in the space when the migration destination of the app is in the inside of the space.

Claim 11 (Previously Presented): An app migration system, comprising at least one processor configured to:

place a groupware app in one of an inside a first virtual place of a plurality of virtual spaces and an outside of the first virtual place of the plurality of virtual spaces, the plurality of virtual spaces each being joined by at least one user in a user group in which information is shareable;

wherein the first virtual space is either a first public space, a first private space, or a first guest space, and wherein the first virtual space has a first permission setting;

set, for the app, a first permission corresponding to a placement location of the app in the first virtual space corresponding to the first permission setting;

migrate the app from the first virtual space to a second virtual space among the plurality of virtual spaces;

wherein the second virtual space is either a second public space, a second private space, or a second guest space, and wherein the second virtual space has a second permission setting which is different than the first permission setting;

set, for the migrated app, a second permission corresponding to a migration destination of the app in the second virtual space corresponding to the second permission setting; and

set the app as a search target in the another one of the plurality of virtual spaces, when the migration destination of the app is in the inside of another one of the plurality of virtual spaces.

Claim 12 (Previously Presented): A non-transitory information storage medium having stored thereon a program for causing a computer to:

place a groupware app in one of an inside and an outside of a first virtual space joined by at least one user in a user group in which information is shareable,

wherein the first virtual space is either a first public space, a first private space, or a first guest space, and wherein the first virtual space has a first permission setting;

set for the app, a first permission corresponding to a placement location of the app in the first virtual space corresponding to the first permission setting;

migrate the app from the first virtual space to a second virtual space in one of a route between a public space and a private space and a route between the inside and the outside of the space;

wherein the second virtual space is either a second public space, a second private space or a second guest space, and wherein the second virtual space has a second permission setting which is different than the first permission setting;

set, for the migrated app, a second permission corresponding to a migration destination of the app in the second virtual space corresponding to the second permission setting.

Claim 13 (Previously Presented): A non-transitory information storage medium having stored thereon a program for causing a computer to:

place a groupware app in one of an inside of a first virtual place of a plurality of virtual spaces and an outside of the first virtual place of the plurality of virtual spaces, the plurality of virtual spaces each being joined by at least one user in a user group in which information is shareable;

wherein the first virtual space is either a first public space, a first private space, or a first guest space, and wherein the first virtual space has a first permission setting;

set, for the app, a first permission corresponding to a placement location of the app in the first virtual space corresponding to the first permission setting;

migrate the app from the first virtual space to a second virtual space among the plurality of spaces;

wherein the second virtual space is either a second public space, a second private space, or a second guest space, and wherein the second virtual space has a second permission setting which is different than the first permission setting;

set, for the migrated app, a second permission corresponding to a migration destination of the app in the second virtual space corresponding to the second permission setting; and

set the app as a search target in the another one of the plurality of virtual spaces, when the migration destination of the app is in the inside of another one of the plurality of virtual spaces.

Claim 14 (Previously Presented): The app migration system according to claim 1, wherein:

the first public space is the space that can be joined by all users,

information in the first public space can be viewed not only by members of the first public space but also by people other than the members of the first public space,

the first private space is the space that can be joined by all users,

information in the first private space can be viewed only by members of the first private space, and

the placement is the inside of or the outside of the first public space or the first private space.

Claim 15 (Previously Presented): The app migration system according to claim 1, wherein the first virtual space is a place in which users of the groupware app communicate to/from each other.

Claim 16 (New): The app migration system according to claim 1, wherein the actual data portion is stored in a data storage.

Claim 17 (New): The app migration system according to claim 8, wherein the condition

is a condition for determining whether or not to permit the migration of the app.

REMARKS

Upon entry of the amendments in this paper, claims 1-17 will be pending in this application. Claim 1 is herein amended. Claims 16 and 17 have been added. No new matter has been entered by way of this amendment. It is submitted that this paper is fully responsive to the Office Action mailed on May 23, 2025.

Examiner Interview:

Applicant thanks the examiner for courteously conducting an interview with applicant's representative on August 12, 2025. As discussed during the interview, applicant amended the claims to clarify the nature of the app, and the conditions for executing the migration. Applicant submits that the claims are patent eligible and not rendered obvious by the cited references. Other contents of the interview can be found in the amendments above and remarks below.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1–7, 12, 14, and 15 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Jaudon et al. (US 20120204235, hereinafter "*Jaudon*"), in view of Aiyar et al. (US 20190235901, hereinafter "*Aiyar*"), and further in view of Rama et al. "A Survey and Comparison of CSCW Groupware Applications", Proceedings of SAICSIT 2006, Pages 198-205 (hereinafter "*Rama*"). Claims 8 and 9 are rejected as being unpatentable over *Jaudon, Aiyar* and *Rama*, and further in view of Igelka et al. (US 20220027182, hereinafter "*Igelka*"). Claims 10, 11, and 13 are rejected as being unpatentable over *Jaudon*, *Aiyar,* and *Rama*, and further in view of Dai et al. (US 20170286158, hereinafter *Dai*).

Claim 1:

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, is not rendered obvious by examiner's cited references:

[1]place a groupware app in one of an inside and an outside of a first virtual space joined by at least one user in a user group in which information is shareable;

[2]wherein the first virtual space is either a first public space, a first private space, or a first guest space, and wherein the first virtual space has a first permission setting;

[3]wherein the app includes an actual data portion and wherein the actual data portion corresponds to the information exchanged within the app;

[4]set, for the app a first permission corresponding to a placement location of the app in the first virtual space corresponding to the first permission setting;

[5]migrate the app from the first virtual space to a second virtual space in one of a route between a public space and a private space and a route between the inside and the outside of the space;

[6]wherein the second virtual space is either a second public space, a second private space or a second guest space, and wherein the second virtual space has a second permission setting which is different than the first permission setting, and

[7]set, for the migrated app, a second permission corresponding to a migration destination of the app in the second virtual space corresponding to the second permission setting.

For feature 1 as numbered above, the examiner contends that *Jaudon* teaches the "place [an app] in one of an inside and an outside of a first [location] . . ." portion of the feature.

The examiner cites *Jaudon* which discloses a system for updating resource access permissions of a user session in response to, for example, a user's physical location. (*See* paragraph [0047]) The examiner notes on page 3 of the office action, that "the user session is mapped to the claimed app."

Applicant submits that *Jaudon* does not disclose "placement of [an app]". As explained in paragraph [0031] of the published application, "[t]he app is a tool for supporting the user's work." As amended, claim 1 recites an actual data portion which corresponds to the information exchanged within the app[1].

Conversely, *Jaudon* describes a session as "a hosted session of a virtual computing environment that may be accessed from one or more client devices. For example, a session may include a thin client session, a virtual application session, a virtual machine session, a virtual operating system session, and/or the like." (*See* paragraph [0027].) This indicates that the session as used in *Jaudon* is ephemeral (i.e., non-persistent) which is held in memory by a server which does not cover the claimed app which has an actual data portion.

Moreover, *Jaudon* explains that a session is not an application. For example, at paragraph [0027], it lists as an example of a session, "a virtual application session." Additionally, at paragraph [0033] it recites that "an application associated with the session." These references demonstrate that a session is distinct from an app as opposed to being an app itself, because the app is configured to run in the session.

Accordingly, as the reference describes a session which is not persistently stored in nature, does not possess its own data, and is treated as distinct from apps in the language of the reference, the session from *Jaudon* does not disclose the recited app.

---

[1] Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in paragraph [0032] of the published application.

<u>Claim 2:</u>

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is not rendered obvious by the examiner's cited references. Claim 2, which depends from claim 1, recites in relevant part:

[1]wherein the at least one processor is configured to set, for the app, a permission specific to the app, and

[2]wherein the settings of the permission specific to the app are maintained even when the app is migrated.

For feature 1 as numbered above, the examiner cites paragraph [0046] of *Jaudon*:

The set of access permissions may include . . . access permissions that are associated with the location 205-*a*. The set of access permissions associated with location 205-*a* may include one or more permissions that are globally applicable to all users at location 205-*a*, one or more permissions that are applicable to a specific subset of users at location 205-*a*, and/or one or more permissions specific only to user 3 at location 205-*a*. In certain examples, the set of access permissions may also include one or more access permissions that are not specifically tied to or associated with any particular location 205-*a*.

Applicant submits that *Jaudon* does not disclose "a permission specific to the app" or "wherein the settings of the permission specific to the app are maintained even when the app is migrated."

As described in paragraph [0048] of the published application, "[t]he access right to the app is one of the settings." It further discloses, "for example, when an icon 130 on the app screen SC3 is selected, an app setting screen for performing the settings of the app on the app screen SC3 is displayed . . . ."

As explained above, *Jaudon* does not disclose that the session itself has its own access permissions because the session does not contain any of its own settings. Rather, it merely controls access to other system resources as a result of the evaluation of rules. (*See* paragraph [0032]). By way of example, if there were two active sessions with identical values for the relevant rules (e.g.

device, user location, etc.) the reference does not disclose a mechanism for configuring one of the

sessions independently from the other.

Accordingly, the sessions do not possess their own settings, and therefore the references

do not disclose all of the claimed features of claim 2.

Claims 3-7 and 10-15:

As claims 3-7 and 10-15 either depend from or recite features similar to claims 1 and 2,

please see the discussion above.

Claim 8:

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 is not rendered obvious by the examiner's cited

references. Claim 8, which depends from claim 1, recites in relevant part:

[1]migrate the app when a predetermined condition is satisfied;

[2]notify a user instructing the migration of the app of a reason that the predetermined
condition is not satisfied, when the predetermined condition is not satisfied

The examiner contends that all the above features, beside those incorporated from claim 1,

are disclosed in *Igelka*.

For feature 1 of claim 8 as numbered above, the cited reference, *Igelka*, in paragraph

[0027], discloses the following: "For a given disk size and rewrite rate, the process may then

determine the timing of when migration should start for each VM involved in the migration."

As described in paragraph [0079] of the published application, "the condition is a condition

for determining whether or not to permit the migration of the app."

The cited disclosure of *Igelka* discussed above is related to making a determination about the sequencing of a migration, *once a larger mass migration is already underway* as opposed to determining *whether* a precondition for the migration itself has been met.

Accordingly, as the reference does not disclose a condition that controls whether or not the migration will be initiated, it does not disclose the first feature of claim 8.

Claim 9:

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is not rendered obvious by the examiner's cited references. Claim 9, which depends from claim 1, recites in relevant part:

[1]migrate the app when a predetermined condition is satisfied

[2]search for the space to which the app is allowed to be migrated based on the predetermined condition

[3]receive, from among the results of the search, designation of the migration destination performed by the user instructing the migration of the app

[4]migrate the app to the migration destination designated by the user

The examiner contends that all the above features, beside those incorporated from claim 1, are disclosed in *Igelka*.

The examiner's cited references for the second and third features of claim 9 do not disclose a search based on the predetermined condition or a user designation of a migration destination. *Igelka* discloses receiving user input: "the process may receive as user input information identifying specific VMs." (*See* paragraph [0027]). However, this user selection occurs *before* any evaluation of migration criteria, in contrast with the published application, wherein the user selects the migration destination *after* the predetermined condition has been used to establish the set of possible migration destinations.

Applicant submits that the cited reference does not disclose "search for the space to which the app is allowed to be migrated based on the predetermined condition" or "receive, from among the results of the search, designation of the migration destination performed by the user instructing the migration of the app."

As described in paragraph [0058] of the published application, the user is presented with "an input form F42 for searching for the space of the migration destination of the app." This feature is not disclosed in the cited references. Therefore, the cited references does not disclose all of the features of this claim.

New Claim 16:

Applicant also submits that new dependent claim 16, depending from claim 1, which further clarifies that the actual data portion is stored in a data storage[2], is not rendered obvious by the examiner's cited references. As the session disclosed in *Jaudon* only discloses an ephemeral process, it does not disclose the data being "stored in a data storage" as recited in claim 16.

New Claim 17:

Applicant also submits that new dependent claim 17, depending from claim 8, which clarifies the condition for executing the migration[3]. Specifically, as *Igelka* discloses a condition that is evaluated while a migration is already in progress, it should not disclose a condition that is evaluated prior to the execution of any migration operation.

Conclusion

---

[2] Support for this feature can be found, for example, in paragraph [0070] of the published application.
[3] Support for this feature can be found, for example, in paragraph [0079] of the published application.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicant's silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such assertions (*e.g.*, whether a reference constitutes prior art, reasons to modify a reference and/or to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

If the Examiner believes that there are issues remaining to be resolved in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite and complete prosecution of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 506039.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dennis M. Hubbs
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 59,145
Telephone: (571)-550-9798

Timothy H. Caine
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 74,025
Telephone: (571)-550-9798

DMH/THC/yn