



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
12/972,756	12/20/2010	Victor Shafran	13909-0247001/2010P00513U	1553

32864 7590 09/23/2016
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. (SAP)
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

PARK, GRACE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

09/23/2016

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte VICTOR SHAFRAN, ELIEZER LEVY, and
MICHAEL STOLLBERG¹

Appeal 2015-005024
Application 12/972,756
Technology Center 2100

Before CAROLYN D. THOMAS, SHARON FENICK, and
MICHAEL J. ENGLE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

ENGLE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a final rejection of claims 1–20. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We AFFIRM.

Technology

The application relates to “generating richer, structured service descriptions for enterprise services.” Spec. ¶ 20. “[E]nterprise services are used . . . to expose business functionality from enterprise systems,” which “makes the business functionality accessible and reusable in a variety of applications and processes deployed in organizations.” *Id.* ¶ 1.

¹ According to Appellants, the real party in interest is SAP SE. Br. 4.

Representative Claim

Claim 1 is representative and reproduced below with the limitations at issue emphasized:

1. A computer-implemented method for generating structured service descriptions corresponding to one or more enterprise services, the method comprising:

storing one or more enterprise services in a business service repository, each of the one or more enterprise services being developed based on a governance process that provides homogeneous naming conventions across enterprise services stored within the business service repository, and being associated with programmatic access information provided in a first format and semi-structured information provided in a second format, the first format being different than the second format;

defining a unified schema based on the governance process, the unified schema explicitly representing the homogeneous naming conventions of the governance process;

executing, using one or more processors, a first data importer and a second data importer, the first data importer being used to retrieve and transform programmatic access information associated with an enterprise service to structured data corresponding to the unified schema, and the second data importer being used to retrieve and transform semi-structured information associated with the enterprise service to the structured data corresponding to the unified schema;

retrieving first data and second data from the business service repository using the first data importer and the second data importer, respectively, the business service repository being provided in a computer-readable storage medium and the first data and the second data corresponding to the enterprise services;

automatically generating, using the one or more processors, structured service descriptions based on the first data and the second data, each of the structured service descriptions corresponding to the unified schema and being associated with one of the enterprise services; and

storing the structured service descriptions in a service repository, the service repository being specific to the unified

schema and being provided in a computer-readable storage medium.

Rejections

Claims 1–10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Swaminathan et al. (US 2011/0072055 A1; Mar. 24, 2011) and Amaru et al. (US 2003/0177481 A1; Sept. 18, 2003). Final Act. 5.

Claims 11 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Swaminathan, Amaru, and Blizniak et al. (US 2003/0220993 A1; Nov. 27, 2003). Final Act. 12.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Swaminathan, Amaru, and Chalana et al. (US 2011/0282934 A1; Nov. 17, 2011). Final Act. 13.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Swaminathan, Amaru, and Behrendt et al. (US 2009/0177634 A1; July 9, 2009). Final Act. 14.

ISSUES

1. Did the Examiner err in finding Swaminathan teaches or suggests “storing one or more enterprise services in a business service repository, each of the one or more enterprise services being developed based on a governance process that provides homogeneous naming conventions across enterprise services stored within the business service repository,” as recited in claim 1?

2. Did the Examiner err in finding the combination of Swaminathan and Amaru teaches or suggests “defining a unified schema based on the governance process, the unified schema explicitly representing

the homogeneous naming conventions of the governance process,” as recited in claim 1?

ANALYSIS

The “storing” step

Claim 1 recites “storing one or more enterprise services in a business service repository, each of the one or more enterprise services being developed based on a governance process that provides homogeneous naming conventions across enterprise services stored within the business service repository.” The Examiner relies on Swaminathan for teaching or suggesting this limitation. Final Act. 5.

Appellants contend that “in the method of Swaminathan[,] different service description languages having different naming conventions for the particular attributes are stored, which is different than storing enterprise services that have homogenous naming conventions.” Br. 13. Yet the Examiner finds “this disclosure is merely a statement of the problem that Swaminathan is intended to solve” and “Swaminathan further discloses . . . generating searchable service descriptions based on a normalized schema, which defines a standard attribute name for each attribute.” Ans. 2–3 (citing Swaminathan ¶ 45); Final Act. 5. The Examiner further finds that “[s]tandardizing attribute names teaches providing homogeneous naming conventions because standardizing the attribute names means that the same attribute in each service is provided with the same name.” Ans. 3.

Appellants have not sufficiently persuaded us of any error in the Examiner’s findings. A mere assertion that the prior art does not teach a particular element without meaningful explanation is unpersuasive. *In re Jung*, 637 F.3d 1356, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2011). That is particularly true when,

as here, the Examiner provides further explanation contradicting Appellants' assertions.

“defining a unified schema . . .”

Claim 1 also recites “defining a unified schema based on the governance process, the unified schema explicitly representing the homogeneous naming conventions of the governance process.” The Examiner relies on the combination of Swaminathan and Amaru for teaching or suggesting this limitation. Final Act. 3–4.

While Appellants argue that Amaru’s teaching is “different from the governance process, which . . . develops one or more enterprise services in a business service repository” (Br. 14), the Examiner correctly points out that Swaminathan was used for teaching that limitation, not Amaru. Ans. 4.

Appellants also contend that “no reasonable interpretation can equate a governance process used to develop enterprise services [as claimed] to [Amaru’s] constraints of business entities used to generate a central information mode.” Br. 14. However, the Examiner finds Amaru teaches “the business entities are generated by a process that is governed by business constraints. As such, it is not unreasonable to equate generation of the business entities and their properties based on the central information model to a governance process used to develop enterprise services.” Ans. 5–6 (citing Amaru ¶¶ 18, 102–103); Final Act. 3–4. Just as with the “storing” step, Appellants have not sufficiently addressed these findings of the Examiner, and a mere assertion that the prior art does not teach a particular claim element without sufficient meaningful discussion is unpersuasive. *Jung*, 637 F.3d at 1365. Thus, Appellants have not persuaded us of any error in the Examiner’s findings.

Accordingly, we sustain the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, and claims 2–20, which Appellants argue are patentable for similar reasons. *See* Br. 15; 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv).

DECISION

For the reasons above, we affirm the Examiner's decision rejecting claims 1–20.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(f).

AFFIRMED