

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of.:

Avi ORON

Serial No.: 12/513,510

Filed: May 5, 2009

For: MEDIA SESSION
IDENTIFICATION METHOD
FOR IP NETWORKS

Examiner: Chi Ho A. LEE

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Confirmation	3332
Group Art Unit:	2472
Attorney Docket:	46203

RESPONSE TO FINAL FILED IN CONJUNCTION WITH RCE

Sir:

This is in response to the United States Patent and Trademark Final Office Action mailed June 15, 2011, which response is being made on or before September 15, 2011, and for which no extension of time fees are due.

A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is also enclosed herewith.

Applicant submits this response for entry into the record, in which:

Amendments to the Claims begin on page 2.

Remarks begin on page 9.

Please amend the above-identified application as follows:

In re Application of: Avi ORON
Serial No.: 12/513,510
Filed: May 5, 2009
Office Action Mailing Date: June 15, 2011

Examiner: Chi Ho A. LEE
Group Art Unit: 2472
Attorney Docket: **46203**
Confirmation No.: 3332

In the Claims:

1. (Currently Amended) Electronic network apparatus for identifying media sessions over IP and network packets as belonging or not belonging to a media session, comprising:

a packet characteristic extraction unit configured for obtaining ~~session-traffic~~ packet characteristics from a succession of packets, said packets respectively belonging to various unknown sessions, ~~said characteristics comprising packet traffic characteristics;~~

a grouping unit associated with said packet characteristic extraction unit, configured to compare packets with other packets according to said extracted traffic characteristics to group together those packets whose extracted packet traffic characteristics are similar as probably belonging to a common session, and

a session analyzer configured for analyzing said grouped packets for session characteristics, therewith to identify a session type of said probable common session.

2. (Original) The apparatus of claim 1, further comprising a resource allocator for allocating at least one member of the group consisting of resources, provisioning features and control features to said session.

3. (Original) The apparatus of claim 1, wherein said session type identification comprises identifying a session managing entity generating or managing said session.

4. (Original) The apparatus of claim 1, wherein said session analyzer comprises a neural network, using characteristics automatically built into said neural network during a neural network training phase.

In re Application of: Avi ORON
Serial No.: 12/513,510
Filed: May 5, 2009
Office Action Mailing Date: June 15, 2011

Examiner: Chi Ho A. LEE
Group Art Unit: 2472
Attorney Docket: **46203**
Confirmation No.: 3332

5. (Original) Apparatus according to claim 1, further comprising a thresholder for thresholding said traffic characteristics, and a packet session identifier configured to identify those packets whose characteristics are mutually within said thresholds for said grouping unit to group said packets as belonging to said common session.

6. (Original) The apparatus of claim 1, wherein said traffic characteristics comprise at least one member of the group consisting of packet length, inter-arrival period, and average bandwidth.

7. (Original) The apparatus of claim 1, wherein said grouping unit comprises a packet marker, associated with said packet session identifier, configured for inserting into a header of a respective packet an indication of said common session with which said respective packet has been identified.

8. (Original) The apparatus of claim 7, further comprising a session analyzer associated with said packet marker, configured to obtain packets marked as belonging to said common session and to determine, from said packets, characteristics belonging to said common session, therefrom to identify a session type.

9. (Original) The apparatus of claim 8, wherein said session analyzer is configured to obtain said characteristics belonging to said common session from parameter patterns common to said packets.

10. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 8, wherein said session analyzer is configured to use at least one member of the group consisting of:

- packet length
- inter-arrival period

In re Application of: Avi ORON
 Serial No.: 12/513,510
 Filed: May 5, 2009
 Office Action Mailing Date: June 15, 2011

Examiner: Chi Ho A. LEE
 Group Art Unit: 2472
 Attorney Docket: **46203**
 Confirmation No.: 3332

- variance of inter-arrival period
- variance of length
- covariance of inter-arrival period
- covariance of length
- a statistical derivative obtained from multi records of packet length
- a statistical derivative obtained from multi records of inter-arrival period
- a histogram built of at least one of the following;
 - i. packet length
 - ii. inter-arrival period
 - iii. variance of inter-arrival period
 - iv. variance of length
 - v. covariance of inter-arrival period
 - vi. covariance of length
 - vii. a statistical derivative obtained from multi records of packet length
 - viii. a statistical derivative obtained from multi records of inter-arrival period
- a matrix histogram built of at least one of the following;
 - i. packet length
 - ii. inter-arrival period
 - iii. variance of inter-arrival period
 - iv. variance of length
 - v. covariance of inter-arrival period
 - vi. covariance of length
 - vii. a statistical derivative obtained from multi records of packet length
 - viii. a statistical derivative obtained from multi records of inter-arrival period.

In re Application of: Avi ORON
 Serial No.: 12/513,510
 Filed: May 5, 2009
 Office Action Mailing Date: June 15, 2011

Examiner: Chi Ho A. LEE
 Group Art Unit: 2472
 Attorney Docket: **46203**
 Confirmation No.: 3332

11. (Original) The apparatus of claim 8, wherein said session analyzer comprises a neural network, using characteristics automatically built into said neural network during a neural network training phase.

12. (Original) The apparatus of claim 1, further comprising a resource allocator configured to allocate resources on a network according to said identified common session.

13. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 8, further comprising a resource allocator, configured to allocate resources on a network according to said identified session type.

14. (Original) The apparatus of claim 1, wherein at least one of said packet session analyzer, said extraction unit and said grouping unit comprises a neural network.

15. (Currently Amended) A method of identifying session type, comprising ~~categorizing-obtaining~~ passing packets of respectively unknown sessions and unknown session types;

~~using-obtaining~~ traffic packet characteristics of said passing packets of respectively unknown session types;

comparing said obtained packets with each other using respectively obtained traffic packet characteristics;

grouping together those packets having similar values of said traffic packet characteristics into a presumed session; and

analyzing said grouped packets of said presumed session for session characteristics;

In re Application of: Avi ORON
 Serial No.: 12/513,510
 Filed: May 5, 2009
 Office Action Mailing Date: June 15, 2011

Examiner: Chi Ho A. LEE
 Group Art Unit: 2472
 Attorney Docket: **46203**
 Confirmation No.: 3332

~~thereby to~~ using said session characteristics to identify a session type of said presumed session.

16. (Original) The method of claim 15 wherein said identifying a session type comprises identifying a session managing entity generating or managing said session.

17. (Original) The method of claim 15 wherein said identifying a session type is followed by at least one of the group comprising: providing provisioning and providing control actions to the session.

18. (Original) Method according to claim 15, further comprising thresholding said traffic characteristics, and identifying those packets whose characteristics are mutually within said thresholds for said grouping.

19. (Original) The method of claim 15, wherein said characteristics comprise at least one member of the group consisting of packet length, inter-arrival period, and average bandwidth.

20. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 15, further comprising inserting into a header of a respective packet an indication of said presumed session with which said respective packet has been identified.

21. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 15, comprising obtaining said characteristics belonging to said presumed session from parameter patterns common to said packets.

22. (Original) The method of claim 15, comprising using at least one member of the group consisting of:

- packet length

In re Application of: Avi ORON
 Serial No.: 12/513,510
 Filed: May 5, 2009
 Office Action Mailing Date: June 15, 2011

Examiner: Chi Ho A. LEE
 Group Art Unit: 2472
 Attorney Docket: **46203**
 Confirmation No.: 3332

- inter-arrival period
- variance of inter-arrival period
- variance of length
- covariance of inter-arrival period
- covariance of length
- a statistical derivative obtained from multi records of packet length
- a statistical derivative obtained from multi records of inter-arrival period
- a histogram built of at least one of the following;
 - i. packet length
 - ii. inter-arrival period
 - iii. variance of inter-arrival period
 - iv. variance of length
 - v. covariance of inter-arrival period
 - vi. covariance of length
 - vii. a statistical derivative obtained from multi records of packet length
 - viii. a statistical derivative obtained from multi records of inter-arrival period
- a matrix histogram built of at least one of the following;
 - i. packet length
 - ii. inter-arrival period
 - iii. variance of inter-arrival period
 - iv. variance of length
 - v. covariance of inter-arrival period
 - vi. covariance of length
 - vii. a statistical derivative obtained from multi records of packet length

In re Application of: Avi ORON
Serial No.: 12/513,510
Filed: May 5, 2009
Office Action Mailing Date: June 15, 2011

Examiner: Chi Ho A. LEE
Group Art Unit: 2472
Attorney Docket: **46203**
Confirmation No.: 3332

viii. a statistical derivative obtained from multi records of inter-arrival period.

23. (Original) The method of claim 15, comprising using a neural network and characteristics automatically built into said neural network during a neural network training phase.

24. (Original) The method of claim 16, further comprising using a neural network and characteristics automatically built into said neural network during a neural network training phase.

In re Application of: Avi ORON
 Serial No.: 12/513,510
 Filed: May 5, 2009
 Office Action Mailing Date: June 15, 2011

Examiner: Chi Ho A. LEE
 Group Art Unit: 2472
 Attorney Docket: **46203**
 Confirmation No.: 3332

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 -24 are in this Application. Claims 1 - 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 1, and 18 have been amended herewith.

Amendments To The Claims

Informalities

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Examiner rejects the independent claims over Tayyar et al.

In considering the claims, Examiner is required to give a meaning to each of the claim limitations.

In the rejection of claim 1 in section 2 of the Office Action the Examiner does not relate to the claimed feature (quote taken from the version of claim 1 prior to the current amendment) of:

a grouping unit associated with said packet characteristic extraction unit, configured to group together those packets whose extracted packet traffic characteristics are similar as probably belonging to a common session

As the Examiner *neither* points out where this feature is found, *nor* does he argue how it is rendered obvious, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is *allowable irrespective of the present amendment*.

Specifically, in the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, the Examiner relates only to the classifier of Tier teaching the packet extraction (it does not – as will be explained below) and the session type identification. However the feature of grouping is not related to.

In the response to arguments, Examiner states:

In re Application of: Avi ORON
 Serial No.: 12/513,510
 Filed: May 5, 2009
 Office Action Mailing Date: June 15, 2011

Examiner: Chi Ho A. LEE
 Group Art Unit: 2472
 Attorney Docket: **46203**
 Confirmation No.: 3332

"nor does group together packets with similar transport characteristics. This limitation not claimed".

Yet as stated above, the claim does define:

"a grouping unit associated with said packet characteristic extraction unit, configured to group together those packets whose extracted packet traffic characteristics are similar as probably belonging to a common session".

Therefore applicant, with all due respect, has some difficulty with Examiner's argument.

Regarding claim 15 the same applies. Specifically, in the rejection of claim 15 in section 2 of the Office Action the Examiner does not relate to the claimed feature of:

"grouping together those packets having similar values of said traffic characteristics into a presumed session".

As the Examiner neither points out where this feature is found and nor does he argue how it is rendered obvious, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is allowable irrespective of the present amendment.

Specifically, in the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, the Examiner relates only to the classifier of Tier teaching the packet extraction (it does not – as will be explained below) and the session type identification. However the feature of grouping is not related to.

In the response to arguments, Examiner states:

"nor does group together packets with similar transport characteristics. This limitation not claimed".

Yet as stated above, the claim (version prior to present amendment) *does* define:

" grouping together those packets having similar values of said traffic characteristics into a presumed session ".

In re Application of: Avi ORON
 Serial No.: 12/513,510
 Filed: May 5, 2009
 Office Action Mailing Date: June 15, 2011

Examiner: Chi Ho A. LEE
 Group Art Unit: 2472
 Attorney Docket: **46203**
 Confirmation No.: 3332

Therefore applicant, with all due respect, has some difficulty with Examiner's argument, and believes that claims 1 and 15 are allowable, even without the current amendments.

Nevertheless, in order to facilitate prosecution, applicant further amends the claims to define that the initial packets are of unknown sessions, and that the grouping is carried out by comparing packets with other packets.

The claims include *inter alia* the following integers, that the packets are of *unknown* session, that the *traffic* characteristics are extracted *from the packets*, and that the packets are grouped into *presumed sessions* based on *similarity* of the *traffic* characteristics. Following the grouping, the characteristics of the presumed session are then studied to find out a *type* of this presumed group. The session characteristics and the transport characteristics are *not* the same.

Tayyar fails to teach *any* of the above integers.

On the contrary, Tayyar has packets of known sessions and the sessions are of known types. No packets are grouped together and there is no teaching of presumed sessions. Although he mentions QoS, he does not mention extraction of characteristics *of a first type* from the *packets themselves* and *then* determine a session type from a characteristic extracted from a *presumed session*. As will be explained below, the QoS in Tayyar is not extracted *from the packets*. Tayyar never groups packets at all since they are *already grouped in sessions* – he merely adds the packets, according to the *already known* grouping, to the respective session queue, and he never teaches probable or presumed sessions or extracts characteristics from such a *presumed session*.

Examiner is required to give due weight *to each feature* pointed out in the claims and to either state where the feature is found, or why it is obvious, and if he cannot do so then he is required to allow the claim.

Tayyar relates to a situation in which packets are already grouped into queues of previously known sessions. Once the known sessions are queued *then* it is decided how to schedule the packets of the session queue to be sent forward. He uses the QoS

In re Application of: Avi ORON
Serial No.: 12/513,510
Filed: May 5, 2009
Office Action Mailing Date: June 15, 2011

Examiner: Chi Ho A. LEE
Group Art Unit: 2472
Attorney Docket: **46203**
Confirmation No.: 3332

of the known session in order to decide how to schedule that queue. He does not teach *presumed* sessions and therefore it is not obvious for Tayyar to use QoS to find the session type of a *presumed* session.

That is to say applicant is arguing that while it may or may not be obvious to use QoS to find a session type of a *known* session, it is *not* obvious to use QoS to determine a session type of a *presumed* session, and this could not be learned from Tayyar since Tayyar does not teach a *presumed* session.

In this respect Examiner's attention is directed to Tayyar paragraph 37, where it states (lines 3 – 5) that "a classifier classifies each of the incoming packets as being associated with one of a plurality of sessions". The sessions of Tayyar's plurality are *known* (note the implication from the term "plurality" that the number of these sessions is known) and it is simply a matter of placing the packet in the queue of the known session to which it belongs.

In the following sentence (Tayyar Paragraph 37 from line 5) it is mentioned that the sessions may correspond to a certain level of quality of service. At no point does paragraph 37 of Tayyar contain the information that the *quality of service* information is used to *identify which session* the packet belongs to, *or to group the packets*, contrary to the requirement of the present claims. Neither is there any information that the packets are compared with *other packets or that characteristics of traffic of the packets are analyzed*. Rather the traffic characteristics are simply *obtained*.

That is to say, it appears from the disclosure as a whole that the sessions are *already known about* and that Tayyar simply *adds* a new packet to an *existing* session. Note in particular component 22 in Figure 1 of Tayyar where the session queues appear to be present and known about. Also note Tayyar paragraph 20, where information about entities and sessions is *provided* to the scheduler.

Tayyar does not teach *grouping of packets of unknown session into groups which are then taken as presumed sessions, followed by obtaining characteristics of the presumed session in order to determine a session type*.

In re Application of: Avi ORON
 Serial No.: 12/513,510
 Filed: May 5, 2009
 Office Action Mailing Date: June 15, 2011

Examiner: Chi Ho A. LEE
 Group Art Unit: 2472
 Attorney Docket: **46203**
 Confirmation No.: 3332

In addition, at numerous locations in Tayyar, there is reference to packets arriving that belong to an *idle* session. See for example Paragraphs 45, and 48. A single packet belonging to an idle session can *only* be considered as part of a *known* session.

In addition, Examiner's attention is drawn to paragraph 70 where it is explained that only two non-trivial calculations need to be carried out by the method, namely the calculation of the virtual time and the finish time. If indeed Tayyar had been grouping packets according to transport characteristics then the grouping itself would be an *additional* non-trivial calculation.

Therefore Tayyar teaches away from the *clearly and definitively* claimed feature that the system of the present claims *groups packets together into presumed sessions*.

Tayyar therefore fails to teach the claimed feature of:

"a grouping unit associated with said packet characteristic extraction unit, configured to *compare packets with other packets according to said extracted traffic characteristics* to group together *those packets whose extracted packet traffic characteristics are similar as probably* belonging to a common session, "

since this teaches grouping according to traffic characteristics to form a presumed session. The claim defines comparing packet with packet and groups together packets whose extracted traffic characteristics look similar into a presumed session – note use of the term "probably" to indicate a probabilistic grouping, not a deterministic grouping. Tayyar merely identifies a packet as part of a *known* session – that is a *deterministic* identification. Tayyar places packets having a common session *identifier* into the corresponding session queue, the session already being known about.

Tayyar fails to teach *probabilistic* identification of a presumed session, only *absolute* determination of a known session.

Tayyar further fails to teach:

In re Application of: Avi ORON
 Serial No.: 12/513,510
 Filed: May 5, 2009
 Office Action Mailing Date: June 15, 2011

Examiner: Chi Ho A. LEE
 Group Art Unit: 2472
 Attorney Docket: **46203**
 Confirmation No.: 3332

"a session analyzer configured for analyzing said grouped packets for session characteristics, therewith to identify a session type of said probable common session"

since the session type already seems to be known. Although Examiner argues that it would be obvious considering Tayyar to use QoS to identify a session type, applicant argues as discussed above, that it is at most obvious to use QoS to identify a type of a known session. There is no teaching of a probable session and therefore it is not obvious based on a reading of Tayyar combined with the skilled person's general knowledge, to extend the use of QoS to find the session type of a session which has only been probabilistically identified in the first place. Probabilistic determinations and definitive determinations are different fields of endeavor with different mathematics and different textbooks and the claim definitively recites the probability aspect.

As a further point, Tayyar clearly had no intention of using QoS as a method of identifying a session. Using several Queues, wherein each queue has different priority and is used by a group or pre-defined protocols / sessions, is common practice in maintaining required Quality-of-Server (QoS) for specific and known -e.g. by UDP or TCP Port number - or settable rule services, thus ensuring user-experience and performance for those sessions. Tayyar is referring to QoS-assurance per session, rather than identifying sessions according to QoS, which would make little sense in any event.

Examiner argues that the QoS corresponds to the claimed feature of *transport characteristics extracted from the packets*. However, Examiner's attention is drawn to the last three lines of Tayyar paragraph 37 where it is stated that the sessions may correspond to a group of packets for which *it is desired to provide* a certain level of QoS. There is no indication in this paragraph as to how the desire referred to comes about, however the Examiner's attention is again drawn to Tayyar paragraph 20 where it is quite clear that the scheduler receives entities to be scheduled and that the entities include sessions. This would be interpreted by the skilled person as meaning that the scheduler is *told* about the sessions, and the QoS characteristics are *provided* along

In re Application of: Avi ORON
 Serial No.: 12/513,510
 Filed: May 5, 2009
 Office Action Mailing Date: June 15, 2011

Examiner: Chi Ho A. LEE
 Group Art Unit: 2472
 Attorney Docket: **46203**
 Confirmation No.: 3332

with the scheduling information, as *opposed* to being gleaned from the grouped packets.

In other words the QoS characteristics are not taught by Tayyar to be extracted from the packets and thus Tayyar fails to teach the claimed feature of

"a packet characteristic extraction unit configured for obtaining traffic packet characteristics from a succession of packets, said packets respectively belonging to various unknown sessions".

For the above reasons it is believed that claim 1 as amended is new and inventive over the prior art.

Independent claim 15 has been amended to include the same features and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons.

Claims 2 – 14 and 16 – 24 are dependent claims and are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that they are dependent on allowable main claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 - 24 are now in condition for allowance. A prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason H. Rosenblum/

Jason H. Rosenblum
 Registration No. 56,437
 Telephone: 718.246.8482

Date: September 14, 2011

Enclosures:

- Request for Continued Examination (RCE)



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE AND FEE(S) DUE

67801 7590 11/09/2011
MARTIN D. MOYNIHAN d/b/a PRTSI, INC.
P.O. BOX 16446
ARLINGTON, VA 22215

EXAMINER

LEE, CHI HO A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2472

DATE MAILED: 11/09/2011

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

12/513,510

05/05/2009

Avi Oron

46203

3332

TITLE OF INVENTION: MEDIA SESSION IDENTIFICATION METHOD FOR IP NETWORKS

APPLN. TYPE	SMALL ENTITY	ISSUE FEE DUE	PUBLICATION FEE DUE	PREV. PAID ISSUE FEE	TOTAL FEE(S) DUE	DATE DUE
nonprovisional	YES	\$870	\$300	\$0	\$1170	02/09/2012

THE APPLICATION IDENTIFIED ABOVE HAS BEEN EXAMINED AND IS ALLOWED FOR ISSUANCE AS A PATENT. PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS CLOSED. THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS. THIS APPLICATION IS SUBJECT TO WITHDRAWAL FROM ISSUE AT THE INITIATIVE OF THE OFFICE OR UPON PETITION BY THE APPLICANT. SEE 37 CFR 1.313 AND MPEP 1308.

THE ISSUE FEE AND PUBLICATION FEE (IF REQUIRED) MUST BE PAID WITHIN THREE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS NOTICE OR THIS APPLICATION SHALL BE REGARDED AS ABANDONED. THIS STATUTORY PERIOD CANNOT BE EXTENDED. SEE 35 U.S.C. 151. THE ISSUE FEE DUE INDICATED ABOVE DOES NOT REFLECT A CREDIT FOR ANY PREVIOUSLY PAID ISSUE FEE IN THIS APPLICATION. IF AN ISSUE FEE HAS PREVIOUSLY BEEN PAID IN THIS APPLICATION (AS SHOWN ABOVE), THE RETURN OF PART B OF THIS FORM WILL BE CONSIDERED A REQUEST TO REAPPLY THE PREVIOUSLY PAID ISSUE FEE TOWARD THE ISSUE FEE NOW DUE.

HOW TO REPLY TO THIS NOTICE:

I. Review the SMALL ENTITY status shown above.

If the SMALL ENTITY is shown as YES, verify your current SMALL ENTITY status:

A. If the status is the same, pay the TOTAL FEE(S) DUE shown above.

B. If the status above is to be removed, check box 5b on Part B - Fee(s) Transmittal and pay the PUBLICATION FEE (if required) and twice the amount of the ISSUE FEE shown above, or

If the SMALL ENTITY is shown as NO:

A. Pay TOTAL FEE(S) DUE shown above, or

B. If applicant claimed SMALL ENTITY status before, or is now claiming SMALL ENTITY status, check box 5a on Part B - Fee(s) Transmittal and pay the PUBLICATION FEE (if required) and 1/2 the ISSUE FEE shown above.

II. PART B - FEE(S) TRANSMITTAL, or its equivalent, must be completed and returned to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) with your ISSUE FEE and PUBLICATION FEE (if required). If you are charging the fee(s) to your deposit account, section "4b" of Part B - Fee(s) Transmittal should be completed and an extra copy of the form should be submitted. If an equivalent of Part B is filed, a request to reapply a previously paid issue fee must be clearly made, and delays in processing may occur due to the difficulty in recognizing the paper as an equivalent of Part B.

III. All communications regarding this application must give the application number. Please direct all communications prior to issuance to Mail Stop ISSUE FEE unless advised to the contrary.

IMPORTANT REMINDER: Utility patents issuing on applications filed on or after Dec. 12, 1980 may require payment of maintenance fees. It is patentee's responsibility to ensure timely payment of maintenance fees when due.

PART B - FEE(S) TRANSMITTAL

Complete and send this form, together with applicable fee(s), to: **Mail** **Mail Stop ISSUE FEE**
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
or Fax **(571)-273-2885**

INSTRUCTIONS: This form should be used for transmitting the ISSUE FEE and PUBLICATION FEE (if required). Blocks 1 through 5 should be completed where appropriate. All further correspondence including the Patent, advance orders and notification of maintenance fees will be mailed to the current correspondence address as indicated unless corrected below or directed otherwise in Block 1, by (a) specifying a new correspondence address; and/or (b) indicating a separate "FEE ADDRESS" for maintenance fee notifications.

CURRENT CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS (Note: Use Block 1 for any change of address)

Note: A certificate of mailing can only be used for domestic mailings of the Fee(s) Transmittal. This certificate cannot be used for any other accompanying papers. Each additional paper, such as an assignment or formal drawing, must have its own certificate of mailing or transmission.

67801 7590 11/09/2011
MARTIN D. MOYNIHAN d/b/a PRTSI, INC.
P.O. BOX 16446
ARLINGTON, VA 22215

Certificate of Mailing or Transmission

I hereby certify that this Fee(s) Transmittal is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage for first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop ISSUE FEE address above, or being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO (571) 273-2885, on the date indicated below.

(Depositor's name)
(Signature)
(Date)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

12/513,510

05/05/2009

Avi Oron

46203

3332

TITLE OF INVENTION: MEDIA SESSION IDENTIFICATION METHOD FOR IP NETWORKS

APPLN. TYPE	SMALL ENTITY	ISSUE FEE DUE	PUBLICATION FEE DUE	PREV. PAID ISSUE FEE	TOTAL FEE(S) DUE	DATE DUE
nonprovisional	YES	\$870	\$300	\$0	\$1170	02/09/2012

EXAMINER	ART UNIT	CLASS-SUBCLASS
LEE, CHI HO A	2472	370-252000

1. Change of correspondence address or indication of "Fee Address" (37 CFR 1.363).

☐ Change of correspondence address (or Change of Correspondence Address form PTO/SB/122) attached.

☐ "Fee Address" indication (or "Fee Address" Indication form PTO/SB/47; Rev 03-02 or more recent) attached. **Use of a Customer Number is required.**

2. For printing on the patent front page, list

(1) the names of up to 3 registered patent attorneys or agents OR, alternatively,

1 _____

(2) the name of a single firm (having as a member a registered attorney or agent) and the names of up to 2 registered patent attorneys or agents. If no name is listed, no name will be printed.

2 _____

3 _____

3. ASSIGNEE NAME AND RESIDENCE DATA TO BE PRINTED ON THE PATENT (print or type)

PLEASE NOTE: Unless an assignee is identified below, no assignee data will appear on the patent. If an assignee is identified below, the document has been filed for recordation as set forth in 37 CFR 3.11. Completion of this form is NOT a substitute for filing an assignment.

(A) NAME OF ASSIGNEE

(B) RESIDENCE: (CITY and STATE OR COUNTRY)

Please check the appropriate assignee category or categories (will not be printed on the patent): ☐ Individual ☐ Corporation or other private group entity ☐ Government

4a. The following fee(s) are submitted:

☐ Issue Fee

☐ Publication Fee (No small entity discount permitted)

☐ Advance Order - # of Copies _____

4b. Payment of Fee(s); (Please first reapply any previously paid issue fee shown above)

☐ A check is enclosed.

☐ Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.

☐ The Director is hereby authorized to charge the required fee(s), any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number _____ (enclose an extra copy of this form).

5. Change in Entity Status (from status indicated above)

☐ a. Applicant claims SMALL ENTITY status. See 37 CFR 1.27.

☐ b. Applicant is no longer claiming SMALL ENTITY status. See 37 CFR 1.27(g)(2).

NOTE: The Issue Fee and Publication Fee (if required) will not be accepted from anyone other than the applicant; a registered attorney or agent; or the assignee or other party in interest as shown by the records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Authorized Signature _____

Date _____

Typed or printed name _____

Registration No. _____

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.311. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
12/513,510	05/05/2009	Avi Oron	46203	3332

67801 7590 11/09/2011
MARTIN D. MOYNIHAN d/b/a PRTSL, INC.
P.O. BOX 16446
ARLINGTON, VA 22215

EXAMINER

LEE, CHI HO A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2472

DATE MAILED: 11/09/2011

Determination of Patent Term Adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154 (b) (application filed on or after May 29, 2000)

The Patent Term Adjustment to date is 155 day(s). If the issue fee is paid on the date that is three months after the mailing date of this notice and the patent issues on the Tuesday before the date that is 28 weeks (six and a half months) after the mailing date of this notice, the Patent Term Adjustment will be 155 day(s).

If a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) was filed in the above-identified application, the filing date that determines Patent Term Adjustment is the filing date of the most recent CPA.

Applicant will be able to obtain more detailed information by accessing the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) WEB site (<http://pair.uspto.gov>).

Any questions regarding the Patent Term Extension or Adjustment determination should be directed to the Office of Patent Legal Administration at (571)-272-7702. Questions relating to issue and publication fee payments should be directed to the Customer Service Center of the Office of Patent Publication at 1-(888)-786-0101 or (571)-272-4200.

Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	12/513,510	ORON, AVI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANDREW LEE	2472	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to 914/11.
2. ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
3. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-24.
4. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: ____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.

THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

5. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
6. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date ____.
 - (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date ____.

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
7. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date ____. |
| 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date ____ | 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material | 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance |
| | 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other ____. |

/ANDREW LEE/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2472