

BOEHMERT & BOEHMERT P.O.Box 150308 80043 München Germany

Europäisches Patentamt

80469 München

Ihr Zeichen / your ref.
19 160 813.2

Ihre Nachricht / your letter

Unser Zeichen / our ref.
H12303WOEP-A

München
05.07.2021

Dr. Steffen Schmidt
Pettenkoferstraße 22
80336 München
Germany

T +49-89 559680
F +49-89-559685090
s.schmidt@boehmert.de
www.boehmert.de

European Patent Application 19160813.2
SERVICE CHAIN FAULT DETECTION METHOD AND
APPARATUS
HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.

In response to the communication pursuant to Art. 94 (3) EPC dated March 3, 2021, it is requested to proceed with the further examination on the basis of new claims 1 to 23 replacing all claims previously on file and the remaining documents as currently on file.

I. AMENDMENTS

Newly filed claim 1 is based on the combination of pending claims 1 and 5.

Newly filed claim 8 is based on the combination of pending claims 9 and 13.

Newly filed claim 12 is based on the combination of pending claims 14 and 18.

Newly filed claim 19 is based on the combination of pending claims 22 and 26.

Dr. Ing. Karl Boehmert PA (1899-1973)
Dipl.-Ing. Albert Boehmert PA (1902-1983)
Wilhelm J. H. Stahlberg RA, Bremen
Dr.-Ing. Walter Hoormann PA*, Bremen
Prof. Dr. Heinz Goddar PA*, München, Shanghai
Dr.-Ing. Roland Liesegang PA*, München
Wolf-Dieter Kuntze RA, Bremen
Dr. Ludwig Kouker RA, Bremen
Dipl.-Ing. Eva Liesegang PA*, München
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Stefan Schohe PA*, München
Dr.-Ing. Matthias Philipp PA*, Bielefeld
Dr. Martin Wirtz RA, Düsseldorf, Berlin
Dr. Carl-Richard Haarmann RA, München
Dipl.-Phys. Christian W. Appelt PA*, München
Dipl.-Phys. Dr.-Ing. Uwe Manasse PA*, Bremen
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Thomas L. Bittner PA*, Berlin
Dr. Volker Schmitz-Fohrmann, M. JUR. RA, München, Paris
Dipl.-Biol. Dr. Jan B. Krauß PA*, München
Dipl.-Biochem. Dr. Markus Engelhard PA*, München
Dipl.-Chem. Dr. Karl-Heinz B. Metten PA*, Frankfurt
Dipl.-Ing. Nils T. F. Schmid PA*, Dea, München, Paris
Dr. Florian Schwab, LL.M. RA, Lic en droit, München
Dr. Andreas Dustmann, LL.M. RA, Berlin, Alicante
Dipl.-Chem. Dr. Volker Scholz PA*, Bremen
Dr. Martin Schaefer RA, Berlin
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Michael Hartig PA*, München
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Steffen Schmidt PA*, München
Dr. Andreas Lucke PA*, München
Dipl.-Chem. Dr. Ute Kilger PA*, Berlin
Malte Nentwig, LL.M. RA, Bremen
Dr. Rudolf Böckenhoff, LL.M. RA, Bremen
Peter Groß, LL.M. RA, München, Alicante
Dipl.-Ing. Felix Hermann PA*, München
Dr. Björn Bahlmann RA, München, Frankfurt
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Dennis Kretschmann PA*, München
Dr. Michael Rüberg, LL.M. RA, München
Dipl.-Phys. Christoph Angerhausen PA*, Düsseldorf
Dipl.-Inform. Dr. Jakob Valvoda PA*, München
Dipl.-Biol. Dr. David Kutenkeuler PA*, München
Dipl.-Chem. Dr. Martin Erbacher PA*, Bremen
Dr. Daniel Herrmann PA*, Frankfurt, München
Dr. Sebastian Engels RA, Berlin
Silke Freund RA, München
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Matthias Hofmann PA*, München
Florian Malescha, M.Sc. PA*, München
—
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Klaus Seranski PA*, Frankfurt, München
Dr. Katrin Seibt RA, Bremen
Dipl.-Biochem. Dr. Sibylla M. Grahm PA*, München
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Xia Plattenzeller PA*, München
Dr. Catharina Götz RA, München
Dipl.-Inform. Fritz Jetzek PA, Bremen
Claudia Deppe RA, München
Dr. Eckhard Ratjen, LL.M. RA, Bremen
Dr. Anja Ruge, LL.M. RA, München
Dipl.-Biochem. Dr. Julia Müller PA, Berlin
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Jin Jeon PA*, München
Dr. Mario Araujo** PA*, München
Mehmet Bengi-Akyürek PA*, München
Dipl.-Tech. Math. Felix Dietrich PA*, Berlin
Lars Eggersdorfer RA, München
Yannick Schütt, M.Sc. Inform. PA*, München
Dipl.-Ing. Simon Cornet PA, Düsseldorf
Dipl.-Ing. Dr. Sebastian Schlegel PA, Berlin
Dipl.-Chem. Robert Bernin PA, Bremen
Dipl.-Ing. Jan Göring PA*, Frankfurt
Dr. Laura Haas, M.Sc. PA, München
Dr. Hanno Fleitje PA, München
Dr. Lennart-Knud Liefelth PA, Frankfurt
Dr. Lara Gwinner PA, München
Alexander Thamer RA, Berlin
Paul Schieler, M.Sc. PA, München

PA Patentanwalt/Patent Attorney *European Patent Attorney
RA Rechtsanwalt/Attorney at Law (Germany)
** Agente de la Propiedad Industrial (Spain) / Spain
Vertretung vor dem EUIPO – Marken und Designs
Representation at EUIPO – Trade marks and Designs

II. OBJECTIONS UNDER ART. 84 EPC

With respect to item 3.1 of the communication, the term “fault detection” in claims 1, 8, 12 or 19 is aimed to detect whether a SF node is attached to the SFE, such as the SFE of the independent claims determines to communicate with a SF node corresponding to the path ID included in the received fault tracing detection request packet, and then obtains the ID of the SF node, and sends the path ID and the ID of the SF node to a device for initiating fault detection. Further, the SFE sends a second fault tracing detection response packet to the device for initiating fault detection to inform it about the ID of the SFE and the path ID. The device for initiating fault detection can determine whether the SF node is correctly attached to the SFE based on the received ID of the SF node, the path ID and the ID of the SF, which is not an action performed by the SFE.

The invention proposes a solution to solve a problem (how to detect whether a SF node is attached to the SFE) based on the use of fault tracing detection request packets. The fault tracing detection request packets detect a SF node and a SFE associated with a service chain, and the solution allows determining the locations of a SF node according to an ID of the SF node, an ID of the SFE and a path ID. Specifically, the SFE of claim 1 obtains an ID of the SF node after determining that the SFE communicates with the SF node. The SFE sends the ID of the SF node by sending a first fault tracing detection response packet (1032) to the device for initiating fault detection and sends a second fault tracing detection response packet to the device for initiating fault detection. The first fault tracing detection response packet (1032) includes the ID of the SF node and the path ID. The second fault tracing detection response packet comprises an ID of the SFE and the path ID. According to the ID of the SF node, the ID of the SFE and the path ID, the device for initiating fault detection can obtain the result of fault detection that is whether the SF node is attached to the correct SFE.

The applicant submits that the wordings of newly filed claim 1, 8, 12 or 19 now define the terms that had been objected to in a clear manner and in terms of technical features. It is hence believed that claim 1, 8, 12 or 19 on file fulfils the requirements of Art. 84 EPC.

With respect to item 3.3, claims 12 and 19 are amended. Based on the amended claims 12 and 19, the objection is overcome.

In response to the request for two-part form in item 5.1, it is submitted that the subject matter of **claim 1 or 8** relates to a method whose method steps are interrelated with each other, while the inventive step concerns changes in several of these interrelated method steps. And the subject matter of **claim 12 or 19** relates to a complex apparatus of functionally inter-related parts, while the inventive step concerns changes in several of these parts of the apparatus. Therefore, the use of the two-part form is considered to be inappropriate, since it would give a distorted picture of the claimed invention and would lead to an artificial lack of clarity of the respective claim. Hence, it is requested to allow the one-part form in the present case.

III. NOVELTY (ART. 54 EPC)

Claim 1 on file was objected to for lacking novelty over D1. However, the subject-matter of claim 1 differs from D1 at least by the following distinguishing feature:

- (i) determining to communicate with a service function, SF, node (121), wherein the first fault tracing detection request packet comprises a path identifier, ID, and the path ID is used to identify a path of a service chain.
- (ii) sending, by the SFE (111), a first fault tracing detection response packet to a device for initiating fault detection, wherein the first fault tracing detection response packet comprises the path ID and the ID of the SF node (121).
- (iii) wherein after the obtaining, by the SFE, the first fault tracing detection request packet, the method further comprises: sending, by the SFE, a second fault tracing detection response packet to the device for initiating fault detection, wherein the second fault tracing detection response packet comprises an ID of the SFE and the path ID.

The present communication refers to the disclosure in paragraphs 65 to 88 of D1. The ring identity disclosed therein to be included in a detection request packet was compared with the path identifier in claim 1. However, D1 defines a ring identity as the identifier of a ring label switched path, LSP, as follows:

“Ring ID refers to a ring identity, and is used to determine a detected ring LSP. The ring identity in the MPLS ring network is unique. That is, every ring LSP is unique.” (see [0021] of D1)

Further, D1 defines a “ring LSP” as a group of nodes, e.g. of label switch routers, LSR, *“forming a closed ring, wherein each node is connected through a bidirectional communication facility to two adjacent nodes”* (cf. [0002] of D1). For example, as disclosed in par. [0030] with respect to Fig. 3, the ring LSP shown therein is formed by the eight LSRs: LSR1 to LSR8.

Further, paragraphs [0046] and [0047] of D1 disclose that the ring ingress node sends the detection request packet to a first intermediate node LSR2 after the ring ingress node LSR1; LSR2 searches the protocol layer of the ring LSP, acquires an outgoing label of LSR2, replaces the outgoing label of LSR1 with the outgoing label of LSR2, and then sends the detection request packet with the replaced label to a next node LSR3; LSR3 replaces the outgoing label of LSR2 in the received detection request packet with an outgoing label of LSR3, and sends the detection request packet to LSR4; LSR4 ejects the outgoing label in the detection request packet, and sends the detection request packet to the ring egress node LSR5. **Thus, the LSR of D1 can not perform service processing provided by an SF node. In D1, any LSR of the ring is used for transmitting the received packet to the next LSR. The structure between the two LSRs is not the same as the structure between an SFE and an SF node of claim 1, as LSR1 sends a detection request packet to LSR2, and LSR2 sends the detection request to LSR3. LSR2 does not perform determining whether to communicate with a node equivalent to the SF node of claim 1 and does not send a response to LSR1 with an ID of the node. Furthermore, none of the LSRs sends a response to the first LSR for sending an ID of the LSR and the ring ID.**

Thus, contrary to claim 1, D1 does not disclose feature (i) to feature (iii).

In view of this, the subject-matter of amended claim 1 is new over D1.

The subject matter of claim 8, 12 or 19 corresponds to that of claim 1, hence, it is also novel.

IV. INVENTIVE STEP (ART. 56 EPC)

D1 is considered to be the closest prior art.

By means of distinguishing features (i) and (iii), the invention achieves the technical effect of allowing detecting faults that cause a service packet to be transmitted over a service chain, wherein the service chain passes service function nodes in an order deferring from the order foreseen in a planned processing order, such as whether the SF node is attached to the SFE. This is achieved by the use of a fault tracing detection request packet, and the fault tracing detection request packet may be sent over a particular path of a service chain identified by a corresponding path identifier. This is further achieved by obtaining an identifier of a service function node and an identifier of a SFE reached by the fault tracing detection request packet over the aforesaid particular path. This allows that each fault tracing detection request packet provided by a service classifier is used to obtain an identifier of one service function node of the service chain (cf. p. 27, l. 15 to 17) and an identifier of a SFE to which the SF node is attached. A device for initiating fault detection may thereby learn information about the service function nodes that the service chain passes through and about the order (whether the SF node is attached to the correct SFE) thereof (cf p. 20, l. 26 to 33 of the present description).

In view of this, the objective technical problem addressed by the present invention can be defined as **how to improve the detection of faults in a service chain**.

The question to be answered is hence whether a person skilled in the art would be prompted to modify the method and an apparatus disclosed in D1 according to distinguishing features (i) and (iii). This is believed not to be the case, since a skilled person wanting to improve the detection of faults in the multi-protocol label switching LSP transport ring network disclosed in **D1 would not even take into consideration the problem of improving the detection of faults in a service chain as the ring of D1 does not implement the function of the service chain and does not include the SF node of the service chain.**

Thus, the subject-matter of amended claims 1 is not only new, but further involves an inventive step.

The subject matter of claim 8, 12 or 19 corresponds to that of claim 1, hence, it also involves an inventive step.

V. CONCLUSION

Thus, the documents now on file should meet all requirements of the EPC. However, if the Examining Division still sees deficiencies in the documents now on file, a telephone conversation with the applicant's representative is suggested. Only as a measure of precaution the applicant's request for

Oral Proceedings

is maintained if the Examining Division does intends to reject the application.

BOEHMERT & BOEHMERT



Dr. Steffen Schmidt

Enclosures:

- New set of claims 1 – 23, clean and marked version