

The examination is being carried out on the **following application documents**:

Description, Pages

2-4, 14-20, 22-36, 38- as published
43, 45-49, 51-53, 55-
62, 65-67, 69, 70, 72,
74, 75

1, 5, 6, 6a, 7-13, 21, received on 19.07.2007 with letter of 09.07.2007
37, 44, 50, 54, 63, 64,
68, 71, 73, 76

Claims, Numbers

1-58 received on 19.07.2007 with letter of 09.07.2007

Drawings, Sheets

1/24-24/24 as published

1. The following document (D2) is cited by the Examiner (see Guidelines C-VI, 8.2 and 8.3). A copy of the document is annexed to the communication and the numbering will be adhered to in the rest of the procedure:

D2: MCGREGOR D. R. ;MARIANI J. A.: "Fingerprinting - A technique for file identification and maintenance" SOFTWARE: PRACTICE AND EXPERIENCE, vol. 12, no. 12, December 1982 (1982-12), pages 1165-1166

2. Article 123(2) EPC

The amendments filed with the letter dated 19.07.2007 introduce subject-matter which extends beyond the content of the application as filed, contrary to Article 123(2) EPC. The amendments concerned are the following:

2.1 In the independent claims 1 and 37, features related to access control have been introduced into the claims. The applicant refers for basis in the description to passages referring to licensing content. Consequently, it does not appear that claimed subject-matter is directly and unambiguously derivable from the description as originally filed, as generic access control as claimed does not appear to have a basis in the description.

2.2 The dependencies between the dependent claims have been amended. However, no basis has been provided for all the new combinations of subject-matter, and not all of them appear to have a basis in the description. The applicant is requested to provide a basis for the amendments in the combination of the subject-matter of the dependent claims.

2.3 New dependent claims have been introduced (27 to 36 and 44 to 57), the applicant is requested to provide basis in the application as originally filed for the introduced subject-matter.

3. Article 52(1) EPC

Compared to the subject-matter considered in section 5 of the communication dated 17.01.2007 (later referred to as C1), the features including access control based on the identifier have been introduced. Having access control information associated with an object identifier (object name) in order to authorize access to an object content is standard in the art. Consequently, a skilled person would implement access control in the system of D1 based on the object identifier without use of any inventive skills (Article 56 EPC).

Consequently, the present application does not meet the requirements of Article 52(1) EPC because the subject-matter of claims 1 and 37 does not involve an inventive step within the meaning of Article 56 EPC.

The same objection could be substantiated based on the disclosure of D2.

It should be noted that if the applicant intended to claim a license control features, this should be based on the basis of the application as originally filed and should be properly supported by the description.

4. Conclusion

It is not at present apparent which part of the application could serve as a basis for a new, allowable claim. Should the applicant nevertheless regard some particular matter as patentable, an independent claim should be filed taking account of Rule 43(1) EPC. The applicant should also indicate in the letter of reply the difference of the subject-matter of the new claim vis-à-vis the state of the art and the significance thereof.

4.1 When filing amended claims the applicant should at the same time bring the description into conformity with the amended claims. Care should be taken during revision, especially of the introductory portion and any statements of problem or advantage, not to add subject-matter which extends beyond the content of the application as originally filed (Article 123(2) EPC).

4.2 April 2009 In order to facilitate the examination of the conformity of the amended application with the requirements of Article 123(2) EPC, the applicant is requested to clearly identify the amendments carried out, irrespective of whether they concern amendments by addition, replacement or deletion, and to indicate the passages of the application as filed on which these amendments are based.