REMARKS

Claims 36-55 are pending in the application.

Claims 36-55 have been rejected.

Claims 36, 46, and 52 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found in at least paragraphs [0044]-[0045] of the present Specification and elements 240 and 245 of FIG. 2.

Claim 56 has been added. Support for the newly-added claim can be found in at least paragraphs [0057]-[0059] of the present Specification.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 36-44, 46-50 and 52-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,802,514 issued to Huber et al. ("Huber") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,203,938 issued to Ambrose ("Ambrose"). While not conceding that the cited references qualify as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicants have chosen to respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection as follows. Applicants reserve the right, for example, in a continuing application, to establish that the cited references, or other references cited now or hereafter, do not qualify as prior art as to an invention embodiment previously, currently, or subsequently claimed.

Applicants respectfully that Huber and Ambrose, taken alone or in any permissible combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations of the independent claims. For example, Huber and Ambrose, taken alone or in any permissible combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest "said designing further comprises identifying an element, wherein said element is an insufficiently-defined element,

identifying a connector, wherein said connector is an insufficiently-defined connector, and receiving information, wherein said information is configured to allow said insufficiently-defined element and said insufficiently-defined connector to be completed," as recited in amended independent Claims 36, 46, and 52, as detailed below.

Huber discusses "a tool for the development of multiple-table database applications for client/server environments" that "automates both capture of system requirements and code production." Abstract, Huber. The tool enables a developer and customer to design an application using a drag-and-drop interface. Col. 5, lines 50-65, Huber. However, nothing in the cited passages of Huber discusses, teaches, or suggests anything about receiving information to complete any sort of incompletely-defined element, much less an insufficiently-defined element and an insufficiently-defined connector, as recited in the amended independent claims.

On the other hand, Ambrose discusses a system for customizing an application program that includes a collection of reusable models for incorporation into end-user derived modules. Col. 2, lines 7-13, Ambrose. However, nothing in the cited passages of Ambrose discusses, teaches, or suggests anything about receiving information to complete any sort of incompletely-defined element, much less an insufficiently-defined element and an insufficiently-defined connector, as recited in the amended independent claims.

In fact, those with skill in the art would not even expect Huber and Ambrose, taken alone or in any permissible combination to disclose, teach, or even suggest the recited limitations of the independent claims because the cited references (alone or in any combination) fail to contemplate the transfer of a process between a non-technical and a

technical interface, as recited in the amended independent claims. Once the process is transferred, a technical user can continue to edit the process using the technical user interface. However, if the process includes incomplete elements, the technical user may have to contact the non-technical user for clarification regarding the incomplete elements. Thus, the amended independent claims address such an issue by including a way to remedy insufficiently-defined connectors and elements.

For at least the forgoing reasons, Huber and Ambrose, taken alone or in any permissible combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations of the independent claims. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 36, 46, and 52 and all claims dependent therefrom are patentable over Huber and Ambrose, taken alone or in any permissible combination. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 36-44, 46-50 and 52-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,802,514 issued to Huber et al. ("Huber") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,203,938 issued to Ambrose ("Ambrose") further in view of U.S. Application Publication No. 2005/0216421 issued to Barry et al. ("Barry"). While not conceding that the cited references qualify as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicants have chosen to respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection as follows. Applicants reserve the right, for example, in a continuing application, to establish that the cited references, or other references cited now or hereafter, do not qualify as prior art as to an invention embodiment previously, currently, or subsequently claimed.

Applicants note that pages 6-7 of the Final Office Action cites Huber, Ambrose, and Barry, taken alone or in any permissible combination, only in support of the rejection of dependent Claims 45, 51, and 55. Thus, Barry is not cited as support for rejecting any of the limitations of independent Claims 36, 46, and 52 (and correctly so, Applicants note). Dependent Claims 45, 51, and 55 are therefore patentable over Huber, Ambrose, and Barry, taken alone or in any permissible combination at least due to the dependency on patentable independent Claims 36, 46, and 52. For at least the forgoing reasons, Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to Deposit Account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald S. Liu
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 64,170
Telephone: (512) 439-5086
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099