

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

| |
|---|
| To: PATEL, N. MILIN HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD, MAIL STOP 35 FORT COLLINS TX 80525 USA |
|---|

| |
|---|
| Date of mailing (day/month/year) 12 January 2015 (12.01.2015) |
|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| Applicant's or agent's file reference 83763918 | FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below |
|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------|
| International application No. PCT/US2014/038059 | International filing date (day/month/year) 15 May 2014 (15.05.2014) | Priority date(day/month/year) |
|---|---|-------------------------------|

| |
|--|
| International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G06F 17/00(2006.01)i |
|--|

| |
|---|
| Applicant HEWLETT-PACKARD DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, L.P. |
|---|

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.
For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Name and mailing address of the ISA/KR International Application Division Korean Intellectual Property Office 189 Cheongsu-ro, Seo-gu, Daejeon Metropolitan City, 302-701, Republic of Korea Facsimile No. +82-42-472-7140 | Date of completion of this opinion 09 January 2015 (09.01.2015) | Authorized officer NHO, Ji Myong Telephone No. +82-42-481-8528 |
|---|--|--|



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US2014/038059

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of :

- the international application in the language in which it was filed
- a translation of the international application into _____ which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b))

2. This opinion has been established taking into account the **rectification of an obvious mistake** authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43*bis*. I(a))

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of a sequence listing filed or furnished:

a. (means)

- on paper
- in electronic form

b. (time)

- in the international application as filed.
- together with the international application in electronic form.
- subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

4. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

5. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/US2014/038059

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|-------------|-----|
| Novelty (N) | Claims | <u>1-15</u> | YES |
| | Claims | <u>NONE</u> | NO |
| Inventive step (IS) | Claims | <u>1-15</u> | YES |
| | Claims | <u>NONE</u> | NO |
| Industrial applicability (IA) | Claims | <u>1-15</u> | YES |
| | Claims | <u>NONE</u> | NO |

2. Citations and explanations :

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US 8627072 B1 (KENNETH J. HENDERSON et al.) 07 January 2014

D2: US 2008-0082540 A1 (CRAIG WEISSMAN et al.) 03 April 2008

D3: US 7333987 B2 (DAVID JUSTIN ROSS et al.) 19 February 2008

D4: US 2012-0096521 A1 (PRASAD PEDDADA) 19 April 2012

D5: EP 1505594 A2 (SONY UNITED KINGDOM LIMITED) 09 February 2005

2.1 Novelty and Inventive Step

2.1.1 Concerning Claims 1-13

2.1.1.1 Independent Claims 1 and 9

Claim 1 differs from D1-D5 in that the method of claim 1 for controlling access to data content comprises: identifying a closure associated with the data content, wherein the data content is bound within the closure, and wherein the closure is parameterized using formal parameters relating to identity of a tenant requesting access to the data content; passing, by an access control system, the tenant data to the closure as actual parameters; and executing the closure based on the tenant data to evaluate access to the data content. And it is not obvious to a person skilled in the art over the documents D1-D5, taken alone or in combination.

Claim 9 relates to a secure access system corresponding to the method of claim 1 and has the same technical features as claim 1. Accordingly, the same reasoning as in claim 1 could be applied to claim 9.

Therefore, claims 1 and 9 are novel and involve an inventive step under PCT Article 33(2) and (3).

Continued on Supplemental Box

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.
Continuation of : Box No. V

2.1.1.2 Dependent Claims 2-8 and 10-13

Claims 2-8 and 10-13 are directly or indirectly dependent on claims 1 and 9 respectively and therefore meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(2) and (3).

2.1.2 Concerning Claims 14-15

2.1.2.1 Independent Claim 14

Claim 14 differs from D1-D5 in that the non-transitory computer-readable medium of claim 14 having a set of computer readable instructions that, when executed, cause an access control system to: determine a closure, wherein the closure, includes and references the data content to be accessed, and further includes tenant related parameters defined as formal parameters; provide the tenant data as a parametric value to the closure; and invoke the closure based on the tenant data to evaluate access to at least a portion of the data content, wherein the portion of the data content for which access is provided is determined based on the tenant data. And it is not obvious to a person skilled in the art over the documents D1-D5, taken alone or in combination. Therefore, claim 14 is novel and involves an inventive step under PCT Article 33(2) and (3).

2.1.2.2 Dependent Claim 15

Claim 15 is dependent on claim 14 and therefore meets the requirements of PCT Article 33(2) and (3).

2.2 Industrial Applicability (PCT Article 33(4))

Claims 1-15 are industrially applicable under PCT Article 33(4).