



# 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.
13/746,893	01/22/2013	Jacob Cherian	102450.00047	5174
108431	7590	12/06/2016	EXAMINER	
Dell c/o Jackson Walker L.L.P. 100 Congress Avenue Suite 1100 Austin, TX 78701			STEVENS, ROBERT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/06/2016	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* JACOB CHERIAN and GAURAV CHAWLA

---

Appeal 2015-007374  
Application 13/746,893  
Technology Center 2100

---

Before CAROLYN D. THOMAS, JEFFREY S. SMITH, and  
TERRENCE W. McMILLIN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SMITH, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is an appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's Final Rejection of claims 1–20, which are all the claims pending in the application. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

*Representative Claim*

1. A method comprising:  
extracting identities of one or more hosts from a storage resource-to-host mapping database associated with a storage resource; and  
for each of the one or more hosts:  
    computing a discovery domain unique identifier based on a host unique identifier;  
    determining if the discovery domain unique identifier is present in a discovery domain database associated with the storage resource; and  
    adding a storage resource unique identifier of the storage resource to an entry of the discovery domain database associated with the storage resource.

*Prior Art*

Mizuno	US 2006/0036818 A1	Feb. 16, 2006
Haynes, Jr.	US 2007/0156974 A1	July 5, 2007
Cherian	US 2011/0093576 A1	Apr. 21, 2011

*Examiner's Rejections*

Claims 1, 2, 5–7, 10, 11, 14–17, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cherian and Mizuno.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 12, 13, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cherian, Mizuno, and Haynes, Jr.

### ANALYSIS

We adopt the findings of fact made by the Examiner in the Final Rejection and Examiner's Answer as our own. We concur with the conclusions reached by the Examiner for the reasons given in the Examiner's Answer. We address the following points for emphasis.

Appellants contend that Cherian fails to teach “for each of the one or more hosts: computing a discovery domain unique identifier based on a host unique identifier” as recited in claim 1. App. Br. 4–9; Reply Br. 2–3. According to Appellants, Table 1 of Cherian shows an association between a discovery domain, host bus adapters, and storage devices, but does not show that the label for the discovery domain is a unique identifier derived from that of the host. Reply Br. 2–3. However, claim 1 does not recite the discovery domain label is derived from that of the host. Appellants' contention is not commensurate with the scope of the claim.

Appellants' Specification discloses a non-limiting example of “computing a discovery domain unique identifier based on a host unique identifier” as:

based on a unique identifier  $x$  for a host 102 (e.g., an iSCSI Qualified Name), federation module 208 may compute a function  $z = G(x)$  where  $z$  is a unique identifier (e.g., alphabetical, numeric, or alphanumeric) for a given discovery domain in a discovery domain database 214 of a storage resource 114. The function  $G(x)$  may be a modulo hash function, assuring that for any value of  $x$ , a unique value of  $z$  will be calculated.

Spec. 14, ll. 18–25. Although this example discloses computing the domain identifier *as a modulo hash function of* the host identifier, claim 1 is not so limited. Rather, claim 1 recites “computing a discovery domain unique identifier *based on* a host unique identifier.” The scope of this limitation, when read in light of Appellants’ Specification, encompasses creating a discovery domain and its identifier based on an identified host.

Paragraph 22 of Cherian teaches that:

When host 210 is connected to iSCSI fabric 230, iSNS client 212 discovers iSNS server 220 that in turn registers the presence of host 210 by adding host 210 to default domain 222. When the administrator uses management station 250 to configure storage system 240 to provide access to host 210, DD [discovery domain] 224 is created . . . and configured to include host 210 and storage system 240.

Thus, Cherian teaches creating a discovery domain 224 based on identified host 210 in need of access to a storage system. We agree with the Examiner that one of ordinary skill would have recognized that the newly created discovery domain has a corresponding “unique identifier” as shown for example in Table 1 of Cherian. *See* Ans. 4–5.

We sustain the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Appellants do not present arguments for separate patentability of claims 2–4, which fall with claim 1. Appellants present arguments for the patentability of claims 5–20 similar to those presented for claim 1 which we find unpersuasive. *See* App. Br. 9–10; Reply Br. 3.

#### DECISION

The Examiner’s rejections of claims 1–20 are affirmed.

Appeal 2015-007374  
Application 13/746,893

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(f).

AFFIRMED