



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.
11/918,620	05/27/2009	Jasvir Singh Gill	2058.163US2	5990
50400	7590	12/05/2014	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/SAP P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			MISIASZEK, AMBER ALTSCHUL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/05/2014	ELECTRONIC

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.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@slwip.com
SLW@blackhillsip.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 11/918,620	Applicant(s) GILL ET AL.	
	Examiner AMBER A. MISIASZEK	Art Unit 3624	AIA (First Inventor to File) Status No

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

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/20/2014.
 A declaration(s)/affidavit(s) under **37 CFR 1.130(b)** was/were filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) 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.
- 4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims*

- 5) Claim(s) 1-7, 10-19, 22, 23 and 25-30 is/are pending in the application.
5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 1-7, 10-19, 22, 23, and 25-30 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

* If any claims have been determined allowable, you may be eligible to benefit from the **Patent Prosecution Highway** program at a participating intellectual property office for the corresponding application. For more information, please see http://www.uspto.gov/patents/init_events/pph/index.jsp or send an inquiry to PPHfeedback@uspto.gov.

Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

Certified copies:

- 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)).

** See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08a and/or PTO/SB/08b)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 3) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 4) Other: _____

The present application is being examined under the pre-AIA first to invent provisions.

DETAILED ACTION

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on August 20, 2014, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/JUSTIN M PATS/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3624

Art Unit: 3624

1. Claims 1-7, 10-19, 22, 23, and 25-30 remain pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see Appeal Brief, filed August 20, 2014, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-7, 10-19, 22, 23, 29, and 30 under 35 USC § 103 and the rejection of claims 25-28 under 35 USC § 102 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of United States Patent Application Publication Number 2006/0047555, Kang, et al., hereinafter Kang.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1-7, 10-19, 22, 23, and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, specifically an abstract idea.

5. Abstract ideas are excluded from patent eligibility based on a concern that monopolization of the basic tools of scientific and technological work might impede innovation more than it would promote it. Still, inventions that integrate the building blocks of human ingenuity into something more by applying the abstract idea in a meaningful way are patent eligible.

Here, Claims 1-7, 10-19 and 22 have been found to be directed to an abstract idea, specifically a resource manager to execute user-initiated tasks according to established rules defining users' permissions for such tasks. Having considered the claims as a whole, no element or combination of elements in the claims are sufficient to ensure that the claims amount to significantly more than the abstract idea itself. Indeed, the claims fail to recite any improvements to another technology or technical field, improvements to the functioning of the computer itself, and/or meaningful limitations beyond generally linking the use of an abstract idea to a particular environment. (IF claim recites generic computer to perform abstract idea – recite here that although the

Art Unit: 3624

claims do recite the use of a computer, nothing more than a generic computer, performing generic, well-understood and routine computer functions, would be required to implement the aforementioned abstract idea).

Therefore, because there are no meaningful limitations in the claim that transform the exception into a patent eligible application such that the claim amounts to significantly more than the exception itself, the claim is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 23 and 25-30, directed to the apparatus/system and computer readable media for performing the method steps are rejected for substantially the same reasons, in that the generically recited computer components in the apparatus/system and computer readable media claims add nothing of substance to the underlying abstract idea.

For more information, see Preliminary Examination Instructions in view of the Supreme Court Decision in *Alice Corporation Pty. Ltd. V. CLS Bank International, et al.* (June 25, 2014), http://www.uspto.gov/patents/announce/alice_pec_25jun2014.pdf and *Alice Corporation Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank International, et al.* 573 U.S. ____ (2014).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-7, 10, 11, 15-17, 19, 23, 25, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication Number 2006/0047555, Kang, et al., hereinafter Kang in view of United States Patent Number 5,706,452, Ivanov, et al., hereinafter Ivanov.**

8. (Previously Presented) As per claim 1, Kang teaches in a system where a computer-driven resource manager selectively executes user-initiated tasks according to established rules defining users' permissions for such tasks, a method of managing redefinition of the rules comprising operations of:

a computer-driven workflow engine receiving a request to change a rule that indicates one or more users that are permitted to initiate a task, the request comprising submission of a completed predefined electronic form by a requestor, (page 1, para. 12). Kang teaches an individual initiating a particular request or workflow object that requires approval by other individuals in the organizational hierarchy.;

responsive to receiving the request, the workflow engine processing the request by performing operations comprising:

reviewing data in the completed electronic form and selecting a corresponding one of multiple predefined approval paths, (page 1, para. 12, A business logic database

Art Unit: 3624

115 is also coupled to authorization engine 105 to provide rules to assist in determining the approval path for each workflow object submitted to the system by original processors);

in an order prescribed by the selected path, performing operations comprising: sequentially proceeding through a sequence of one or more stages defined by the selected approval path, where in each stage the workflow engine electronically solicits approvals from one or more approvers indicated by the selected approval path, (page 2, para. 14, authorization engine 225 determines the appropriate individuals within the organizational hierarchy who should receive the workflow object for approval);

responsive to receiving all approvals required by the selected approval path, transmitting an electronic message directing amendment of the rules according to the request, (page 2, para. 19 and page 3, paragraphs 20-23). Kang teaches Re-authorization engine 210 retrieves re-authorization rules from rule configuration storage 260 that describe how each type of personnel change event is to be handled. FIG. 5A is a table showing a plurality of personnel change events and respective instructions regarding "how to handle" each event and the fetched rules are then applied to each impacted document to determined the new routing path for that document.

Kang does not explicitly teach continuing through the stages until the workflow engine receives a completion event comprising one of the following: at least one denial, or all approval required by the selected approval path.

However, Ivanov teaches continuing through the stages until the workflow engine receives a completion event comprising one of the following: at least one denial,

Art Unit: 3624

or all approval required by the selected approval path, (col. 4, lines 7-10). Ivanov teaches that all reviewers must approve a document in order for the document to be approved, and a single rejection from any reviewer suffices to reject the document.

At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Kang with the teaching of Ivanov. As suggested by Ivanov, one would have been motivated to include this feature for structuring the process of participatory document evaluation by a plurality of reviewers, (see Ivanov, Abstract), to modify the method of Kang with the teaching of Ivanov.

9. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 2, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang does not explicitly teach the operations further comprising: transmitting electronic notification of each completion event to the requestor.

However, Ivanov teaches the operations further comprising: transmitting electronic notification of each completion event to the requestor, (col. 15, lines 26-39 and col. 23, lines 43-46). Ivanov teaches that when the document is finalized, meaning that the document has been approved by the appropriate reviewers, document notifications are sent to the appropriate recipients.

At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Kang with the teaching of Ivanov. As suggested by Ivanov, one would have been motivated to include this feature for structuring the process of participatory document evaluation by a plurality of reviewers, (see Ivanov, Abstract), to modify the method of Kang with the teaching of Ivanov.

Art Unit: 3624

10. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 3, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang teaches receiving the electronic message directing amendment of the rules, a human system administrator reconfiguring software settings of the resource manager to implement the amendment of the rules, (Fig. 3, page 2, paragraphs 16 and 17, and page 3, para. 21). Kang teaches that the rules have to be re-authorized when there is a change in the organizational hierarchy.

11. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 4, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang teaches the operations further comprising: computer-driven equipment receiving the electronic message directing amendment of the rules and, in response thereto, reconfiguring software settings of the resource manager to implement the amendment of the rules, (Fig. 3, page 2, paragraphs 16 and 17, and page 3, paragraphs 21 and 23). Kang teaches that the rules have to be re-authorized when there is a change in the organizational hierarchy and rerouting a document to the determined authority.

12. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 5, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang further teaches wherein:

the operations further include establishing a set of initiators, the initiators comprising different possible completions of the predefined electronic form, and defining an association between the initiators and the predefined approval paths, (page 2, para. 14, authorization engine 225 determines the appropriate individuals within the organizational hierarchy who should receive the workflow object for approval);

the operation of reviewing data in the request and selecting a corresponding one of multiple predefined approval paths comprising:

reviewing data in the completed electronic form to identify a corresponding initiator, (page 1, para. 3, In many workflow systems, the authority and routing path for approval is determined at the time when the workflow object is input into the workflow system for routing and approval, page 2, para. 14, authorization engine 225 determines the appropriate individuals within the organizational hierarchy who should receive the workflow object for approval);

determining which predefined approval path is associated with the identified initiator, (page 2, para. 12, A business logic database 115 is also coupled to authorization engine 105 to provide rules to assist in determining the approval path for each workflow object submitted to the system by original processors, page 1, para. 14, authorization engine 225 determines the appropriate individuals within the organizational hierarchy who should receive the workflow object for approval);

selecting the associated approval path, (page 2, para. 14, authorization engine 225 determines the appropriate individuals within the organizational hierarchy who should receive the workflow object for approval, and page 2, para. 17, the submitter can provide an initial approval path for a workflow object or document and then the system can check the validity of that path).

13. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 6, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang further teaches the operations further comprising:

Art Unit: 3624

a human system administrator defining the predefined approval paths and directing computer-driven equipment to prepare a machine-readable record of the predefined approval paths, the record accessible by the workflow engine, (page 2, paragraphs 17 and 18, The workflow objects or documents 250 to be reviewed and read may be stored on multiple information handling system as indicated in FIG. 3A which shows documents 250 as including document 001 (Sys1:Doc1, Processor A), document 002 (Sys2:Doc2 Processor B.), document 003 (Sys2:Doc3, Processor C) and document 004 (Sys1:Doc1, Processor E). Sys1 and Sys2 refer to different information handling systems on which the documents may be stored. Processors A, B, C and D refer to different human processors for the documents System agent 205 monitors documents with determined authority 250 to determine which of those documents are impacted by changes in the organizational hierarchy).

14. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 7, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang does not explicitly teach where the following features are present in the predefined approval paths: parallel paths, conditional branches.

However, Ivanov teaches where the following features are present in the predefined approval paths: parallel paths, conditional branches, (col. 3, lines 36-41, Parallel evaluation is a possible solution to the performance problem. Complications arise when there are data dependencies in the evaluation process, and col. 8, lines 10-19, Independent aspects can be evaluated in parallel, thus reducing the overall evaluation time for document).

Art Unit: 3624

At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Kang with the teaching of Ivanov. As suggested by Ivanov, one would have been motivated to include this feature for structuring the process of participatory document evaluation by a plurality of reviewers, (see Ivanov, Abstract), to modify the method of Kang with the teaching of Ivanov.

15. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 10, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang further teaches further comprising:

responsive to the workflow engine receiving directions from one or more of the approvers indicated by the selected approval path to dynamically change the selected approval path, implementing the dynamic changes, (page 1, para. 13, shows one embodiment of the disclosed workflow system 200 that addresses the problems described above. System 200 includes a system agent 205 which seeks out workflow objects or documents that are impacted by a change in the organizational hierarchy. System agent 205 cooperates with a re-authorization engine 210 that takes the impacted workflow objects or documents and sends the impacted workflow objects to new processors who are found to be the appropriate processors after taking into account the change in the organizational hierarchy. This re-authorization is triggered by the change event in the organizational hierarchy which is monitored by system agent 205. Thus, the re-authorization may be referred to as being event triggered in this embodiment).

16. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 11, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang further teaches further comprising:

Art Unit: 3624

in one or more of the stages, receiving and implementing any directions of the approvers indicated by the selected approval path to dynamically change the selected approval path, the directions including: sidetracking approval, delegating for report-back, re-routing approval, (page 3, para. 23, the rules in rule configuration storage 260 are fetched by re-authorization engine 210 which applies the fetched rules to impacted document 001, Sys1:Doc1, impacted document 002 (Sys2:Doc2) and impacted document Sys2:Doc3. The fetched rules are then applied to each impacted document to determine the new routing path for that document. For example, as seen in FIG. 3B, document 001 is rerouted to the "head of the original organization"; document 002 is rerouted to "the head of the new organization").

17. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 15, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang further teaches further comprising in one or more of the stages, the workflow engine performing operations comprising: requiring one or more approvers indicated by the selected approval path to invoke at least one of the following computer-driven processes: assigning a predefined role, removing a predefined role, defining and assigning a new role, (page 1, para. 13, System agent 205 cooperates with a re-authorization engine 210 that takes the impacted workflow objects or documents and sends the impacted workflow objects to new processors who are found to be the appropriate processors after taking into account the change in the organizational hierarchy. This re-authorization is triggered by the change event in the organizational hierarchy which is

Art Unit: 3624

monitored by system agent 205. Thus, the re-authorization may be referred to as being event triggered in this embodiment).

18. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 16, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang further teaches further comprising at least one of the following:

computer-driven operations of identifying rule changes appropriate to the request, and proposing the identified rule changes to one or more approvers indicated by the selected approval path, (page 1, para. 12). Kang teaches an individual initiating a particular request or workflow object that requires approval by other individuals in the organizational hierarchy;

computer-driven operations of identifying rule changes appropriate to the request, and filtering potential rule changes of the one or more approvers indicated by the selected approval path to exclude inappropriate rule changes, (page 1, para. 12 and page 1, para. 13, System 200 includes a system agent 205 which seeks out workflow objects or documents that are impacted by a change in the organizational hierarchy.

System agent 205 cooperates with a re-authorization engine 210 that takes the impacted workflow objects or documents and sends the impacted workflow objects to new processors who are found to be the appropriate processors after taking into account the change in the organizational hierarchy. This re-authorization is triggered by the change event in the organizational hierarchy which is monitored by system agent 205. Thus, the re-authorization may be referred to as being event triggered in this

Art Unit: 3624

embodiment). Kang teaches an individual initiating a particular request or workflow object that requires approval by other individuals in the organizational hierarchy.

19. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 17, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang further teaches further comprising at least one of the following:

responsive to designation of one or more predefined roles by an approver indicated by the selected approval path or by the request, computer-driven operations of identifying and suggesting assignment of one or more additional roles, (page 1, paragraphs 12-13, System 200 includes a system agent 205 which seeks out workflow objects or documents that are impacted by a change in the organizational hierarchy. System agent 205 cooperates with a re-authorization engine 210 that takes the impacted workflow objects or documents and sends the impacted workflow objects to new processors who are found to be the appropriate processors after taking into account the change in the organizational hierarchy. This re-authorization is triggered by the change event in the organizational hierarchy which is monitored by system agent 205. Thus, the re-authorization may be referred to as being event triggered in this embodiment).

20. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 19, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang teaches where the request to change the rules comprises one of the following:

a user-initiated request to change the rules comprising submission of a

Art Unit: 3624

user-completed electronic form, (page 1, para. 12, Original processors 120 are typically individuals initiating a particular request or workflow object 125 that requires approval by other individuals in the organizational hierarchy);

a machine-initiated request to change the rules comprising machine

generation of the electronic form, (page 1, para. 12, a conventional workflow system is shown generally as system 100. System 100 includes an authorization engine 105

which is a program or application residing on an information handling system or

computer (not shown). An employee/organization database 110 is coupled to

authorization engine 105 to provide the authorization engine with information regarding

the organizational hierarchy of the particular organization in which the system is to be

employed. For example, organization database 110 includes employee name,

department manager, group manager, etc. A business logic database 115 is also

coupled to authorization engine 105 to provide rules to assist in determining the

approval path for each workflow object submitted to the system by original processors).

21. Regarding claims 23 and 29-30, these claims are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1 above.

22. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 25, Kang teaches one or more computer readable storage media tangibly embodying a program of machine-readable instructions executable by a digital processing apparatus to perform operations, applied in a system where a computer-driven ERP authority selectively executes user-initiated tasks according to established roles defining users' permissions to initiate such tasks, said operations comprising:

Art Unit: 3624

storing a list of predefined workflows, each workflow defining a progression of mandatory actions for processing a given user request to change one or more existing roles or add one or more new roles, the progression including a prescribed order of the actions including actions performed by one or more approvers designated in the workflow, the actions selected from a group including: approval of a user requested role change or addition, modification of a user requested role change or addition, designation of a role to suit the user request, (page 1, para. 12, a conventional workflow system is shown generally as system 100. System 100 includes an authorization engine 105 which is a program or application residing on an information handling system or computer (not shown). An employee/organization database 110 is coupled to authorization engine 105 to provide the authorization engine with information regarding the organizational hierarchy of the particular organization in which the system is to be employed. For example, organization database 110 includes employee name, department manager, group manager, etc. A business logic database 115 is also coupled to authorization engine 105 to provide rules to assist in determining the approval path for each workflow object submitted to the system by original processors);

storing one or more maps relating the workflows to various predefined sets of characteristics of possible user requests to change the roles, (Fig. 3A and Fig. 4A, page 2, para. 18, Such events include a) a processor (non-organization head) resigns, b) a processor (organization head) resigns, c) a change within the organization by a processor, for example when a processor moves from one department to another, and d) the organization no longer exists. When the term "non-organization head" is used, it

Art Unit: 3624

includes managers, supervisors and other approvers in the organization under the organization head);

responsive to user request to change a role, applying the map to the user request to identify a corresponding workflow, and thereafter proceeding in the prescribed order to notify and obtain performance of the actions by designated approvers of the identified workflow, and only upon successful completion of the identified workflow, permitting implementation of change to the roles as stated in the user request or modified or initiated by an approver, (Fig. 3A and Fig. 4A, page 2, para. 18, Such events include a) a processor (non-organization head) resigns, b) a processor (organization head) resigns, c) a change within the organization by a processor, for example when a processor moves from one department to another, and d) the organization no longer exists. When the term "non-organization head" is used, it includes managers, supervisors and other approvers in the organization under the organization head).

23. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 27, Kang teaches the media of claim 25 as described above. Kang further teaches where one or more of the workflows include multiple stages and alternate paths, where one alternate path or another is automatically determined according to results from earlier stages, (page 3, para. 23).

Kang teaches rerouting a document for approval. Examiner interprets the rerouting of a document to encompass an alternate path.

Art Unit: 3624

24. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 28, Kang teaches the media of claim 25 as described above. Kang does not explicitly teach the group of actions further includes dynamic changes to the workflow including:

a given approver re-routing the order to another for specified work and then back to the given approver after completion of the specified work; and

a given approver declining to act and instead substituting another approver.

However, Ivanov teaches the group of actions further includes dynamic changes to the workflow including:

a given approver re-routing the order to another for specified work and then back to the given approver after completion of the specified work,(Fig. 4, col. 9, lines 25-65, and col. 26, lines 30-43). Ivanov teaches that some reviewers cannot proceed with their reviews until they have received information from another department, ; and

a given approver declining to act and instead substituting another approver; (col. 18, lines 23-29). Ivanov teaches that if a reviewer does not respond, then a secondary reviewer can replace the primary reviewer.

At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Kang with the teaching of Ivanov. As suggested by Ivanov, one would have been motivated to include this feature for structuring the process of participatory document evaluation by a plurality of reviewers, (see Ivanov, Abstract), to modify the method of Kang with the teaching of Ivanov.

Art Unit: 3624

25. Claims 12-14, 18, 22, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication Number 2006/0047555, Kang, et al., hereinafter Kang in view of United States Patent Number 5,706,452, Ivanov, et al., hereinafter Ivanov and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication Number 2006/0143231, Boccasam, et al., hereinafter Boccasam.

26. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 12, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang in view of Ivanov does not explicitly teach further comprising in one or more of the stages, additional operations comprising:

responsive to approver selection of a risk analysis option, computer-driven equipment analyzing the request as received from the requestor or modified or proposed by the approver to determine if fulfillment thereof would violate predetermined guidelines as to segregation of duties, regulatory compliance, or audit rules.

However, Boccasam teaches further comprising in one or more of the stages, additional operations comprising:

responsive to approver selection of a risk analysis option, computer-driven equipment analyzing the request as received from the requestor or modified or proposed by the approver to determine if fulfillment thereof would violate predetermined guidelines as to segregation of duties, regulatory compliance, or audit rules, (page 3, paragraph 33, page 5, para. 47). Boccasam teaches monitoring business processes or transactions to determine if they impact regulatory compliance.

Art Unit: 3624

At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Kang in view of Ivanov with the teaching of Boccasam. As suggested by Boccasam, one would have been motivated to include this feature for for continuously monitoring the user activity, transactions, and configurations of enterprise applications, (see Boccasam, page 1, para. 3), to modify the method of Kang in view of Ivanov with the teaching of Boccasam.

27. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 13, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang does not explicitly teach further comprising in one or more of the stages, the workflow engine performing operations comprising requiring one or more approvers indicated by the selected approval path to invoke a computer-driven analysis to determine whether fulfilling the request as received from the requestor or modified or proposed by the approver would violate predetermined guidelines as to segregation of duties, regulatory compliance, or audit rules.

However, Boccasam teaches further comprising in one or more of the stages, the workflow engine performing operations comprising requiring one or more approvers indicated by the selected approval path to invoke a computer-driven analysis to determine whether fulfilling the request as received from the requestor or modified or proposed by the approver would violate predetermined guidelines as to segregation of duties, regulatory compliance, or audit rules, (page 3, paragraph 33, page 5, para. 47). Boccasam teaches monitoring business processes or transactions to determine if they impact regulatory compliance.

At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Kang in view of Ivanov with the teaching of Boccasam. As suggested by Boccasam, one would have been motivated to include this feature for for continuously monitoring the user activity, transactions, and configurations of enterprise applications, (see Boccasam, page 1, para. 3), to modify the method of Kang in view of Ivanov with the teaching of Boccasam.

28. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 14, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang does not explicitly teach further comprising in one or more of the stages, additional operations comprising:

computer-driven equipment analyzing the request as received from the requestor or modified or proposed by the approver to determine if fulfillment thereof would violate predetermined guidelines as to segregation of duties, regulatory compliance, or audit rules; and

responsive to a violation, blocking amendment of the rules according to the request as analyzed.

However, Boccasam teaches further comprising in one or more of the stages, additional operations comprising:

computer-driven equipment analyzing the request as received from the requestor or modified or proposed by the approver to determine if fulfillment thereof would violate predetermined guidelines as to segregation of duties, regulatory compliance, or audit rules, (page 3, paragraph 33, page 5, para. 47). Boccasam

Art Unit: 3624

teaches monitoring business processes or transactions to determine if they impact regulatory compliance.

responsive to a violation, blocking amendment of the rules according to the request as analyzed, (page 3, para. 33, A continuous monitoring approach allows for ongoing review of business controls and transactions watching for conflicts, anomalies, violations, and exceptions. If a potential problem is detected, the continuous monitoring solution can notify the appropriate individuals for further investigation and correction if needed. The result is a more timely approach to detection and correction of specific transactions and processes that fall outside a business' predefined criteria for acceptability).

At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Kang in view of Ivanov with the teaching of Boccasam. As suggested by Boccasam, one would have been motivated to include this feature for for continuously monitoring the user activity, transactions, and configurations of enterprise applications, (see Boccasam, page 1, para. 3), to modify the method of Kang in view of Ivanov with the teaching of Boccasam.

29. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 18, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang does not explicitly teach comprising in one or more of the stages, the workflow engine making available to approvers indicated by the selected approval path a computer-driven mitigation process including developing measures to mitigate targeted properties of the request as received from the requestor or modified or proposed by the approver, where said targeted properties present a risk of violating

Art Unit: 3624

predetermined guidelines as to segregation of duties, regulatory compliance, or audit rules.

However, Boccasam teaches comprising in one or more of the stages, the workflow engine making available to approvers indicated by the selected approval path a computer-driven mitigation process including developing measures to mitigate targeted properties of the request as received from the requestor or modified or proposed by the approver, where said targeted properties present a risk of violating predetermined guidelines as to segregation of duties, regulatory compliance, or audit rules, (page 3, paragraph 33, page 5, para. 47). Boccasam teaches monitoring business processes or transactions to determine if they impact regulatory compliance.

At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Kang in view of Ivanov with the teaching of Boccasam. As suggested by Boccasam, one would have been motivated to include this feature for for continuously monitoring the user activity, transactions, and configurations of enterprise applications, (see Boccasam, page 1, para. 3), to modify the method of Kang in view of Ivanov with the teaching of Boccasam.

30. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 22, Kang teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Kang does not explicitly teach where the rules define users' permissions for user-initiated tasks including opening door locks, deactivating alarm systems, and granting and revoking access to physical areas.

However, Boccasam teaches where the rules define users' permissions for user-initiated tasks including opening door locks, deactivating alarm systems, and granting

Art Unit: 3624

and revoking access to physical areas, (page 1, para. 10, Once the modules and processes are operating correctly, the doors can be closed and locked, and the keys given to the appropriate people who need access).

At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Kang in view of Ivanov with the teaching of Boccasam. As suggested by Boccasam, one would have been motivated to include this feature for for continuously monitoring the user activity, transactions, and configurations of enterprise applications, (see Boccasam, page 1, para. 3), to modify the method of Kang in view of Ivanov with the teaching of Boccasam.

31. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 26, Kang teaches the media of claim 25 as described above. Kang does not explicitly teach where the mandatory actions further include one or more of the approvers conducting risk analysis to determine whether a proposed change in the roles would violate predetermined guidelines as to segregation of duties, regulatory compliance, or audit rules.

However, Boccasam teaches where the mandatory actions further include one or more of the approvers conducting risk analysis to determine whether a proposed change in the roles would violate predetermined guidelines as to segregation of duties, regulatory compliance, or audit rules, , (page 3, paragraph 33, page 5, para. 47).

Boccasam teaches monitoring business processes or transactions to determine if they impact regulatory compliance.

At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Kang in view of Ivanov with the teaching

Art Unit: 3624

of Boccasam. As suggested by Boccasam, one would have been motivated to include this feature for for continuously monitoring the user activity, transactions, and configurations of enterprise applications, (see Boccasam, page 1, para. 3), to modify the method of Kang in view of Ivanov with the teaching of Boccasam.

Conclusion

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amber A. Misiaszek whose telephone number is (571) 270-1362. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30-5, F 7:30-4, every other Friday Off.

33. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justin Pats can be reached on 571-270-1363. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300.

34. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) computer-accessible medium. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR computer-accessible medium, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR computer-accessible medium, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information computer-accessible medium, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or (571) 272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 11/918,620

Page 28

Art Unit: 3624

/A. A. M./

Examiner, Art Unit 3624

November 26, 2014

/DAVID RINES/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3624