

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 8-9, and 16-17 stand rejected.

Claims 2-7, 10, 12, and 18-20 are objected to.

Claims 1-2, 4, 9, 11-12, 17, and 19-20 are currently amended.

Claims 21-23 are new.

Thus, claims 1-23 remain pending in this patent application.

Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the presently claimed application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks Examiner for indicating that claims 2, 4, 10, 12, 18, and 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 8-9 and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2015/0227404 (“Rajagopal”) in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2016/254998 (“Jokela”). Claim 1 has been amended based on claim 4, claim 9 has been amended based on claim 12, and claim 17 has been amended based on claim 20.

Rajagopal discloses that when an SDS 400 receives a central fault report from SA 455, the SDS 400 may perform service fault segregation to identify one or more fault nodes where a fault may have occurred and identify rules to be executed by an RE 404 to identify remediation measures. The SDS 400 may use service chain information and other received service faults to identify the nodes.

Jokela discloses that an SPE or an SFE of a network node returns a data packet to an SCLA, which is the issuer of an iBF with complementing information to forward a data packet in line with a result of a DPI. Subsequently, the SPE or the SFE receives an updated iBF where one more link identifier, as indicated in the complementing information, such that the data packet can be forwarded to its intended node (see paragraph [0088]).

The combination of Rajagopal and Jokela fails to disclose an SFE sending a path ID, an ID of a SF node, and an ID of the SFE to a device for initiating fault detection in response to obtaining a request packet on a service chain.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 9 and 17, as amended, are patentable over the combination of Rajagopal and Jokela.

Claim 2-8 and 21 are dependent on amended claim 1, claim 10-16 and 22 are dependent on amended claim 9, and claim 18-20 and 23 are dependent on amended claim 17. Based on amended claims 1, 9 and 17, claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-23 are patentable over the combination of Rajagopal and Jokela.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Consideration of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the application, and withdrawal of the rejections and objections is respectfully requested by Applicant. No new matter is introduced by way of the amendment. It is believed that each ground of rejection raised in the Office Action dated August 6, 2020 has been fully addressed. If any fee is due as a result of the filing of this paper, please appropriately charge such fee to Deposit Account Number 50-1515 of Conley Rose, P.C., Texas. If a petition for extension of time is necessary in order for this paper to be deemed timely filed, please consider this a petition therefor.

If a telephone conference would facilitate the resolution of any issue or expedite the prosecution of the application, then Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below.

Respectfully submitted,
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.

Date: November 6, 2020

/Jonathan K. Polk/
Jonathan K. Polk
Reg. No. 66,334

5601 Granite Parkway, Suite 500
Plano, TX 75024
(972) 731-2288
(972) 731-2289 (Facsimile)

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT