

Declaration of Tal Lavian, Ph.D., in Support of Petition
for Covered Business Method (CBM) Review of
U.S. Patent No. 8,646,093

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ServiceNow, Inc.
Petitioner

v.

BMC Software, Inc.
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,646,093
Filing Date: December 9, 2009
Issue Date: February 4, 2014

TITLE: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT
DATABASE SOFTWARE LICENSE COMPLIANCE

DECLARATION OF TAL LAVIAN, PH.D.

Table of Contents

	Page
I. BRIEF SUMMARY OF MY OPINIONS	1
II. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS	3
A. Qualifications and Experience	3
B. Materials Considered.....	7
III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	8
IV. STATE OF THE ART OF THE RELEVANT TECHNOLOGY AT THE TIME OF THE ALLEGED INVENTION	10
A. Software and Software License Contracts	10
B. Managing Compliance with Software License Contracts.....	11
C. Using a Configuration Management Database (CMDB) to Manage Compliance with Software Licenses	14
V. The '093 Patent's Technique for software license compliance.....	17
A. The Specification.....	17
B. The Challenged Claims of the '093 Patent	22
C. Claim Construction	24
1. "license certificate"	24
2. "model" and "modeling"	27
VI. OPINIONS REGARDING PATENT-ELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER.....	28
A. Are Claims 1, 5, 10-13, and 16 Directed to an Abstract Idea?	29
1. Claim 1	29
2. Claim 5	35
3. Claim 10	36
4. Claims 11-13 ("License Type" Claims).....	37
5. Claim 16.....	39
B. Do Claims 1, 5, 10-13, and 16 Provide Meaningful Limitations?.....	39
1. Claim 1	40

Table of Contents
(continued)

	Page
2. Dependent Claims 5, and 10-13.....	45
3. Independent Claim 16.....	46
VII. Conclusion.....	48

Declaration of Tal Lavian, Ph.D., in Support of Petition
for Covered Business Method (CBM) Review of
U.S. Patent No. 8,646,093

I, Tal Lavian, Ph.D., declare as follows:

1. I have been retained by counsel for ServiceNow, Inc. (Petitioner) in this case as an expert in the relevant art.

2. I have been asked to provide my opinions relating to claims 1, 5, 10-13, and 16 of U.S. Patent No. 8,646,093 to Myers et al. (“the ’093 patent”), which I understand is owned by BMC Software, Inc.

3. I have previously submitted a declaration in connection with a Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of the ’093 patent, IPR2015-01555 (filed July 3, 2015), in which I provided opinions regarding application of certain prior art references to claims 1, 5, 10-13, and 16 of the ’093 patent. My opinions here regarding the level of ordinary skill in the art and the construction of certain terms from the ’093 patent are the same as those in my earlier Declaration in IPR2015-01555.

I. BRIEF SUMMARY OF MY OPINIONS

4. Claims 1, 5, 10-13, and 16 generally describe a method and system for ensuring that an organization has deployed a software product in a manner that is consistent with its software license contract. In my opinion, these claims are not patentable because they are directed to an abstract idea.

5. In particular, the challenged claims are directed to the abstract idea of

Declaration of Tal Lavian, Ph.D., in Support of Petition
for Covered Business Method (CBM) Review of
U.S. Patent No. 8,646,093

ensuring that an enterprise is in compliance with its software license contracts.

This abstract idea is composed of the abstract ideas of: (1) gathering information about how a software product has been installed in an enterprise, (2) locating the license contract for the product; and (3) comparing the product installations against the license contract to determine compliance or non-compliance. As I will show in **Part IV.B** and **Part VI.A.1** below, this abstract process is performed manually by human beings who create a list of where a software product is installed in an enterprise, and compare that list against the product's license contract.

6. As explained in detail in **Part VI.B**, claims 1, 5, 10-13, and 16 also fail to recite any limitations or technical requirements that could meaningfully transform them into something more than the abstract idea. The claims instead recite technologies that were conventional and routine to persons of ordinary skill in the art, such as the use of a standard Configuration Management Database (CMDB) to store information about software products and software contracts. The bases for my opinions are set forth below.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.