

Internal distribution code:

- (A) [-] Publication in OJ
- (B) [-] To Chairmen and Members
- (C) [-] To Chairmen
- (D) [X] No distribution

**Datasheet for the decision
of 27 June 2019**

Case Number: T 2276/16 - 3.5.07

Application Number: 06823608.2

Publication Number: 1908071

IPC: G11B27/10, G11B27/32,
G06F17/30, G11B20/10

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Method and apparatus for creating last uniform resource identifier, and recording medium storing program for executing the method

Applicant:

Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.

Headword:

LastURI/SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 56

Keyword:

Inventive step - (no)



Beschwerdekammern
Boards of Appeal
Chambres de recours

Boards of Appeal of the
European Patent Office
Richard-Reitzner-Allee 8
85540 Haar
GERMANY
Tel. +49 (0)89 2399-0
Fax +49 (0)89 2399-4465

Case Number: T 2276/16 - 3.5.07

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.07
of 27 June 2019

Appellant: Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.
(Applicant) 129, Samsung-ro
Yeongtong-gu
Suwon-si, Gyeonggi-do, 443-742 (KR)

Representative: Appleyard Lees IP LLP
15 Clare Road
Halifax HX1 2HY (GB)

Decision under appeal: Decision of the Examining Division of the
European Patent Office posted on 10 May 2016
refusing European patent application No.
06823608.2 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC

Composition of the Board:

Chairman R. Moufang
Members: R. de Man
M. Jaedicke

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The applicant (appellant) appealed against the decision of the Examining Division refusing European patent application No. 06823608.2, published as international application WO 2007/029921.
- II. The Examining Division decided that all claims 1 to 3 of a sole substantive request lacked clarity and that their subject-matter lacked inventive step over the following document:

D2: "MPV Core Specification", Revision 1.01,
11 March 2003, retrieved from <http://www.osta.org/mpv/public/specs/MPVCore-Spec-1.01.pdf>.
- III. In its statement of grounds of appeal, the appellant maintained its sole substantive request and submitted copies of the application documents.
- IV. In a communication accompanying the summons to oral proceedings, the Board expressed the preliminary view that claims 1 and 2 lacked any basis in the application as filed and were not clear, and that the subject-matter of claim 1 was either not new or not inventive over document D2.
- V. In a letter dated 4 June 2019, the appellant withdrew its request for oral proceedings and informed the Board that it would not be attending the oral proceedings. It requested that the Board issue a final written decision based on the written submissions already made. It did not comment in substance on the Board's communication.
- VI. The Board then cancelled the oral proceedings.

VII. The appellant requests that the decision under appeal be set aside and that a patent be granted on the basis of the sole substantive request.

VIII. Claim 1 of the sole substantive request reads as follows:

"A method of creating a LastURI (uniform resource identifier) included in an MPV (MusicPhotoVideo) file generated in accordance with MPV Core specification, the LastURI specifying location of a content asset in a multimedia environment and providing means by which the content can be read and reproduced, the method comprising:

determining whether information indicating the location of the content asset includes information indicating a network domain; and

if the information indicating the location of the content asset includes the information indicating the network domain, creating the information indicating the location of the content asset as a first lastURI of the content asset; and

if the information indicating the location of the content asset do [sic] not include the information indicating the network domain, creating information omitting information regarding a file system from the information indicating the location of the content asset as a second LastURI of the content asset."

IX. The appellant's arguments, where relevant to the decision, are discussed in detail below.

Reasons for the Decision

1. The appeal complies with the provisions referred to in Rule 101 EPC and is therefore admissible.
2. *The invention*
 - 2.1 The application relates to a category of uniform resource identifiers referred to as "LastURI", as defined in the MPV standards developed by the Optical Storage Technology Association. MPV files produced according to the MPV standards include a LastURI, also referred to as "LastURL", that allows a content asset to be accessed and reproduced (paragraph [5] of the published application).
 - 2.2 MPV files and LastURIs are explained in more detail in document D2, which corresponds to revision 1.01 of the MPV Core Specification. Although the document states that the abbreviation MPV stands for "MusicPhotoVideo" (see page 7, first paragraph), whereas the present application suggests that it stands for "multiphoto video" (see paragraphs [3] and [8]), the Board has no reason to doubt that document D2 is part of the MPV standards referred to in the application.
 - 2.3 Document D2, on page 15, explains that an "MPV Manifest" is an XML file that may contain MPV components such as asset lists, manifest links, albums and mark lists. As explained on page 18, second paragraph, MPV data is metadata describing photo/video asset collections and related information; it does not contain the actual asset data files themselves.

2.4 The primary means by which MPV data references asset files is the LastURI/LastURL identifier, which can be a local filename or a remote URL (D2, page 17, third full paragraph). A LastURI includes either a relative or an absolute pathname, allowing the manifest file to be moved either with the assets or separate from the assets (D2, page 32, fourth paragraph; page 105, second, third and seventh paragraphs).

2.5 The invention essentially proposes generating a LastURI with an absolute pathname if the asset file is available from a network domain and with a relative pathname if the asset file is available locally (see paragraphs [9], [26], [27] and [33] to [35] and Figure 4 of the published application).

3. *Interpretation of claim 1*

3.1 Claim 1 is directed to "a method of creating a LastURI (uniform resource identifier) included in an MPV (MusicPhotoVideo) file generated in accordance with MPV Core specification". Its steps relate to the creation of a LastURI and make no further mention of the MPV file. For the purpose of assessing inventive step, the Board will - to the appellant's benefit - interpret the claim as implying a step of including the created LastURI in the MPV file.

3.2 The claimed method starts with "information indicating the location of the content asset". It first determines whether this location information includes "information indicating a network domain".

3.3 If a network domain is indicated, "the information indicating the location of the content asset as a first [L]astURI of the content asset" is created. In the

light of the application as a whole (see point 2.5 above), this is to be understood as meaning that a LastURI with an absolute pathname is created.

- 3.4 If a network domain is not indicated, "information omitting information regarding a file system from the information indicating the location of the content asset as a second LastURI of the content asset" is created. In the light of the application as a whole (see point 2.5 above), this is to be understood as meaning that a LastURI with a relative pathname is created, i.e. a pathname not indicating ("omitting") a drive name.

4. *Inventive step*

- 4.1 As explained in points 2.2 to 2.4 above, document D2 discloses that MPV files according to the MPV Core Specification contain LastURIs through which content assets can be accessed and which include either a relative pathname or an absolute pathname.
- 4.2 The document recommends: (1) that relative pathnames be used if "the MPV manifest moves along with the assets it refers to" (page 105, second and third paragraphs), and (2) that absolute pathnames be used if "the MPV manifest moves independently of the assets it refers to" (page 105, second and seventh paragraphs).
- 4.3 The method of claim 1 reflects the first recommendation in the case that the content asset is not located in a network domain (but in a file system). It reflects the second recommendation in the case that the content asset is located in a network domain. The Board fails to see anything inventive in following these recommendations in such common circumstances.

4.4 In its statement of grounds of appeal, the appellant referred to page 35 of document D2, which referred to arguments included in a LastURL that had to be removed by an application that used the LastURL to open a local file. The claim feature "omitting information regarding a file system" obviated the need for such an application to remove those arguments.

However, document D2, on page 35, refers to arguments in standard URL syntax that follow the actual path indication, for example "lastURL?arg1=<value1>&args2=<value2>". Both the present application and claim 1 are silent on such arguments. In particular, the feature "omitting information regarding a file system" does not refer to such an argument. The appellant's argument in support of inventive step is therefore not convincing.

4.5 Hence, the subject-matter of claim 1 lacks inventive step (Article 56 EPC).

5. *Conclusion*

Since the sole substantive request cannot be allowed, the appeal is to be dismissed.

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is dismissed.

The Registrar:

The Chairman:



I. Aperribay

R. Moufang

Decision electronically authenticated