



BARDEHLE
PAGENBERG
DOST
ALTENBURG
GEISSLER

Patent- und Rechtsanwälte - Postfach 86 06 20 - 81633 München

European Patent Office

80298 München

EPO - Munich
44

18. Nov. 2009

Munich, November 18, 2009

European Patent Application No. 96 910 762.2

Kinetech, Inc.

Our ref: D 113401 WO/EP A1/Tef

Udo W. Altenburg
Galileiplatz 1
81679 München

Tel. +49 (89) 92 80 5-0
Fax +49 (89) 92 80 5-444
altenburg@bardehle.de
www.bardehle.com

In response to the Communication dated May 5, 2009:

I.

Applicant submits, without prejudice, an amended set of claims 1 to 26 to replace the pending claims 1 to 58. Copies of the amended claims are enclosed in clean and mark-up formats.

The new set of amended claims comprises one independent claim on a system (claim 1) and one on a method (claim 15). The amended claims are based on the pending claims and the original disclosure as shown in the following table:

MÜNCHEN
DÜSSELDORF
PARIS
BARCELONA
ALICANTE



BARDEHLE
PAGENBERG
DOST
ALTENBURG
GEISSLER

Amended claim	Pending claim	Original claim	Description
1	1	1	Item 9, page 62, 63
2	22	18	Page 65
3	23	19	
4	24	20	
5	26	29	
6	27	new	License table, page 20
7	29	new	Item 9, page 62, 63
8	32	new	Page 23, line 9
9	33	new	Page 23, line 12
10	New		Page 23, line 33
11	New		Page 22, lines 16-22
12	New		Page 40, lines 1-5
13	New		Page 8, line 28
14	New		Page 11 bridging page 12
15	37	30	Item 9, page 62, 63
16 to 18	New		Correspond to amended system claims 2-4
19	58	53	
20	55	New	Page 23, line 9
21	56	New	Page 23, line 12
22 to 25	New		Correspond to amended system claims 11-13, 15
26	54	new	Page 8, line 28



BARDEHLE
PAGENBERG
DOST
ALTENBURG
GEISSLER

The amended claims now recite specifically the aspect of licensing in the context of access control; the basic mechanism is the use of the specific identifier “true name” described in the application so that all features related therewith are also disclosed in connection with the licensing aspect.

The aspect of licensing is discussed in the specification specifically under the following quotes:

Page 13, lines 3 and 4: using the “true name”, i.e. the unique identifier for a particular data item for accounting and licensing purposes; this quote has also been used to define the specific problem underlying the present invention.

Page 15, lines 20 to 24: the license table identifying files which may only be used by licensed users, in a manner independent of their name or location.

Page 20: lines 18 et seq. and Fig. 9: format of the license table

Page 62 line 24 to page 63 line 22: track for licensing purposes

Page 7, lines 17 to 21: “the system tracks possession of specific data items according to content by owner ..” in connection with the aspect of accounting, which is closely related to licensing.

The original disclosure to support the claim dependency is demonstrated in the above table so that item 2.2 is also answered taking into consideration the greatly reduced number of claims in the amended set. The objection under Art. 123 (2) EPC in item 2.1 of the Communication is therefore met.

In amended claim 6, the term “entity” has been used to denote both users of the system and the system components that may request access to a data item; cf. with respect to licensed “users” page 15, line 20 et seq. and page 20 describing the licensing table and with respect to system components page 62, step B (i) which refers to “the user processor .. authorized..”.



BARDEHLE
PAGENBERG
DOST
ALTENBURG
GEISSLER

Pages 5 and 6 on file are further amended to briefly acknowledge document D2 and to bring the description into conformity with the amended claims. Copies of the amended pages are enclosed.

II.

The amended independent claims are now clearly directed to the licensing feature described in particular on the pages of the original application cited above. The suggestion by the examining division in item 3 of the Communication is thus followed.

Neither document D1 nor D2 teach or suggest this use of access control in connection with licensing of content based on identifiers in the format of “true names”. The invention as defined in the amended claims is therefore both novel and has inventive step.

In case further substantive objections arise against the patentability of the application, which cannot be resolved in the written proceedings, an interview or oral proceedings in accordance with Art. 116 EPC are requested.

Dr. Wolfgang Bublak
European Patent Attorney

Encls.

- Amended claims 1 to 26 (clean and marked-up)
- Amended description pages 5, 5a and 6