



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.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

11/542,281

10/03/2006

Issac Stephen Levin

OIC0114C1US

5720

60975 7590 10/16/2009
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP
11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE
BLDG. H, SUITE 250
AUSTIN, TX 78758

EXAMINER

KE, PENG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/16/2009

PAPER

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.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 11/542,281	Applicant(s) LEVIN ET AL.	
	Examiner SIMON KE	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 36-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 36-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 7/7/09.

Claims 36-55 are pending in this application. Claims 36, 46, and 52 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 7/7/09, claims 1-35 were added and claims 36-55 were added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 36-44, 46-50, and 52-54 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huber US Patent 5,802,514 in view Ambrose US Patent 7,203,938.

As per claim 36, Huber teaches a method comprising:

modeling a business process, wherein said modeling comprises designing a process, wherein said process represents a non-technical model of said business process, (see Huber col. 7, lines 1-7) and

said designing is performed using a non-technical user interface, in response to an indication that said process is complete (see Huber, col. 7, lines 5-50, Huber, col. 1, lines 40-70)

However, Huber fails to teach transferring access to said process from said non-technical user interface to a technical user interface implementing said process wherein

Art Unit: 2174

said implementing implements said process as a technical model of said business process, and said implementing is performed using a technical user interface.

Ambrose teaches transferring access to said process from said non-technical user interface to a technical user interface implementing said process wherein said implementing implements said process as a technical model of said business process, and said implementing is performed using a technical user interface. (see Ambrose, col. 7, lines 25-42)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Ambrose's teaching with method of Huber in order to allow use to implement any technical changes.

As per claim 37, Huber and Ambrose teach the method of claim 36, Humber teaches wherein said modeling further comprises: editing said process, wherein said editing is performed using said non-technical user interface. (see Huber col. 7, lines 1-7)

As per claim 38, Huber and Ambrose teach the method of claim 37. Ambrose wherein said process is an existing process. (see Ambrose, col. 7, lines 25-42)

As per claim 39, Huber and Ambrose teach the method of claim 38. wherein said modeling further comprises: selecting said existing process from a plurality of existing processes, wherein a business process library comprises said existing processes. (see Ambrose, col. 5, lines 45-70)

As per claim 40, Huber and Ambrose teach the method of claim 36. Ambrose further teaches wherein said transferring comprises: analyzing said process, wherein said analyzing is performed in response to said process being checked-in from said non-technical user interface;

if a step is missing from said process, identifying said step as a missing step; (see Ambrose, col. 7, lines 25-42)

if said process comprises a new element, identifying said new element; (see Ambrose, col. 7, lines 25-42; indicated by checks)and

if said process comprises a new connection, identifying said new connection. (see Ambrose, col. 7, lines 25-42; indicated by checks)

As per claim 41, Humber and Ambrose teach the method of claim 40, wherein said transferring further comprises:

if said missing step is identified, flagging said missing step; if said new element is identified, flagging said new element; and if said new connection is identified, flagging said new connection. (see Ambrose, col. 7, lines 25-42)

As per claim 42, Humber and Ambrose teach the method of claim 36. Ambrose further teaches wherein said implementing comprises:

displaying a systems view of said process; (see Ambrose, col. 7, lines 25-42)

Art Unit: 2174

determining whether an element needs to be added to said process; (see Ambrose, col. 7, lines 25-42)and

if said element needs to be added to said process, indicating said element needs to be added to said process. (see Ambrose, col. 7, lines 25-42)

As per claim 43, Humber and Ambrose teach the method of claim 36. Humber teaches wherein said implementing comprises:

identifying an element, wherein (see Humber, col. 4, lines 1-30)
said element is a non-executable element; (see Humber, col. 4, lines 1-30)and
identifying a connector, wherein said connector is a non-executable connector.
(see Humber, col. 4, lines 1-30)

As per claim 44, Humber and Ambrose teach the method of claim 36. Ambrose teaches wherein said modeling further comprises: integrating said process with an external service. (see Ambrose, col. 7, lines 60-70)

defining a transform, wherein said transform defines a transformation between said first format and said second format. (see Ambrose, col. 7, lines 60-70)

As per claims 46 and 52, they are rejected under the same rationale as claim 36. Supra.

As per claim 47, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 37 and 38. Supra.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 48 and 54, they are rejected under the same rationale as claim 40.
Supra.

As per claim 49, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 41. Supra.

As per claim 50, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 42. Supra.

As per claim 53, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 37. Supra.

Claims 36-44, 46-50, and 52-54 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huber US Patent 5,802,514 in view Ambrose US Patent 7,203,938 further in view of US Publication Barry 2005/0216421

As per claim 45, Humber and Ambrose teach the method of claim 44. However, they fail to teach wherein said integrating comprises:

defining a source,
said source defines a location of said external service, and
said source further defines an access mode for said external service;
defining a format, wherein
said format defines a first format for addressing said external service, and
said format further defines a second format to be used to transfer data
from said external service; and
defining a transform wherein
said transform defines a transformation between said first format and said second
format.

Barry teaches wherein said integrating comprises:

defining a source, (see Barry, paragraph 0349)

Art Unit: 2174

said source defines a location of said external service, (see Barry, paragraph 0349)
and

said source further defines an access mode for said external service; (see Barry,
paragraph 0349)

defining a format, (see Barry, paragraph 0141) wherein
said format defines a first format for addressing said external service, (see Barry,
paragraph 0141)and

said format further defines a second format to be used to transfer data
from said external service; (see Barry, paragraph 0141)and

defining a transform wherein
said transform defines a transformation between said first format and said second
format. (see Barry, paragraph 0141)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include
Barry's teaching with method of Humber and Ambrose in order provide user with
viewing of various type data from different back-end telecommunications service and
applications at a single point of customer contact.

As per claims 51 and 55, they are rejected under the same rationale as claim 45.
Supra.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 36-55 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SIMON KE whose telephone number is (571)272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peng Ke

/Peng Ke/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174