REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1 recites, in part, that a virtual security coprocessor is created in a first processing system and then transferred to a second processing system for use by that second system. The cited art including Proudler nowhere teaches or suggests this subject matter. As contended support, the Office Action refers to a small portion of Proudler, namely paragraphs 114-117. However neither this portion of Proudler or anywhere else in the reference teaches that contended by the Office Action.

Instead, this portion of Proudler is simply describing an authentication of a virtual trusted device by way of a well-known challenge/response process. Nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion of transferring a virtual security coprocessor from one processing system to another. Instead in Proudler, the virtual trusted devices 37 at all times remain within computer platform 10. While responses such as a signed integrity metric and certificates may be sent between computer systems, nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion of transferring of a virtual trusted device 37 from computer platform 10. Accordingly, claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over the cited art. For at least similar reasons, independent claims 8 and 14 and their dependent claims are similarly patentable.

With regard to dependent claims 2, 9 and 15, the Office Action contends that the additional recited subject matter of generating an endorsement key for the virtual security coprocessor in the first processing system is met by the additional disclosure in paragraphs 66-69 of Proudler. However, this portion of Proudler is simply directed to a conventional mechanism for initializing a trusted device. However, this trusted device is taught to be a hardware device and is in no way a virtual security coprocessor. Still further, this initialization and measuring of an integrity metric of a computing platform is in no way done in connection with transmitting a virtual security coprocessor to another processing system as discussed above, this itself is nowhere taught or suggested in Proudler.

Regarding independent claim 5, for at least similar reasons as discussed above Proudler fails to teach the recited receiving in a first processor system of a virtual security coprocessor from a second processing system. This is so, as paragraphs 114 and 115 fail to teach this subject matter, as discussed above. Still further, the contended support for the further subject matter in claim 5 of using such a virtual security coprocessor to perform an operation is also nowhere taught or suggested. Instead, the contended support identified in the Office Action, namely

paragraphs 66-69 are simply directed to a hardware device, namely a trusted device 24 and its initialization and operation. Nevertheless, this trusted device is not the recited virtual security coprocessor. Accordingly, claim 5 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over the cited art. For at least similar reasons, independent claims 12 and 18 and their dependent claims are similarly patentable.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 13, 2009

/Mark J. Rozman/

Mark J. Rozman
Registration No. 42,117
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 S. Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, Texas 77057-2631
(512) 418-9944 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]
Customer No.: 21906