

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

KRANSELL & WENNBORG KB
P.O. Box 2096
SE-403 12 GÖTEBORG

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43*bis*.1)

Date of mailing <i>(day/month/year)</i>	02-10-2018
--------------------------------------------	-------------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference 170330PC	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
----------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

International application No. PCT/SE2018/050652	International filing date <i>(day/month/year)</i> 19-06-2018	Priority date <i>(day/month/year)</i> 05-07-2017
-----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
See Supplemental Box

Applicant
IRISITY AB

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 43*bis*.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 66.1*bis*(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/SE Patent- och registreringsverket Box 5055 S-102 42 STOCKHOLM Facsimile No. + 46 8 666 02 86	Date of completion of this opinion 02-10-2018	Authorized officer Ewa Björk Telephone No. + 46 8 782 28 00
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: cover sheet

International Patent Classification (IPC)

G06Q 30/02 (2012.01)

G08B 25/00 (2006.01)

G06Q 50/26 (2012.01)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/SE2018/050652

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*.1(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:
 - a. forming part of the international application as filed:
 - in the form of an Annex C/ST.25 text file.
 - on paper or in the form of an image file.
 - b. furnished together with the international application under PCT Rule 13*ter*.1(a) for the purposes of international search only in the form of an Annex C/ST.25 text file.
 - c. furnished subsequent to the international filing date for the purposes of international search only:
 - in the form of an Annex C/ST.25 text file (Rule 13*ter*.1(a)).
 - on paper or in the form of an image file (Rule 13*ter*.1(b) and Administrative Instructions. Section 713).
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 forming part of the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
5. Additional comments:

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

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>1-14</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	_____	YES
	Claims	<u>1-14</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-14</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO

2. Citations and explanations

Cited documents

D1: 20080244605 A1

D2: 20170046794 A1

Reasoning

Independent claim 1

Independent claim 1 does not fulfil the requirement of clarity according to Article 6 PCT, see Box VIII.

Independent claim 1 discloses a computer implemented method performed by a security system, the security system adapted to apply gamification techniques to a security service provided by the security system, wherein the security system comprises:

- A first computing device having a graphical user interface (GUI) adapted to be handled by a first user, the first user being assigned a user skill level, and
- A server connected to the first computing device over a network, wherein the server implements a gamification environment to process a plurality of security service events,

Wherein the method comprises the steps of:

- A. Receiving, at the server, a notification of at least one security service event;
- B. Determining, from the notification, a task to be performed to handle the at least one security service event, wherein the task is associated with a task skill level;
- C. Assigning, at the server, the task to the first user;
- D. Presenting, using the GUI of the first computing device, the task to be performed by the first user;
- E. Receiving, at the server, feedback information relating to completion of the task, and
- F. Determining, at the server, a score of performance of the task for the first user based on the task, the task skill level and the user skill level.

D1, the closest prior art, discloses a system for determining a set of skill information

.../...

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: Box No. V

associated with user performance which is considered to correspond to gamification techniques according to the features of claim 1. The system manages tasks associated to e.g. errors and emergency maintenance which corresponds to the possible tasks of a security system (see [0034]). These features correspond to the preamble of claim 1.

The system comprises:

- A computing device with a graphical interface adapted to be handled by a user/TRM resource (see [0038]). The user/TRM resource being assigned a resource skill level (see [0033]). These features correspond to A.
- A TRM computing system (see [0021]) which is connected to the computing device over a network (see [0038]). The computing system handles a plurality of tasks (see [0029]) by implementing a method corresponding to the gamification method of claim 1. These features correspond to B.

The method disclosed in D1 comprises the following steps:

- The TRM computing system determines a task by means of e.g. a predetermined condition, which corresponds to a notification. The task may include one or more work items (see [0034]). The task is associated with a task skill level (see [0036]). These features correspond to A and B.
- The task is assigned to a user (see [0063]). This corresponds to C.
- The user is notified about the assigned task. The notification comprises presentation via a graphical interface (see [0088]). This corresponds to D.
- The TRM computing system displays a task progress indicator (see [0068]) where indication of a completed task is given (see [0069]). This corresponds to E.
- A review or feedback process following completion of a task (see [0033]). This corresponds partly to F.

The claimed invention differs from what is disclosed in D1 in that a score of performance based on the task, the task skill level and the user skill level is determined at the server, i.e. in part of step F. This feature lacks technical effect and does not contribute to the solution of the invention defined by claim 1, other than a computer implementation of the review and feedback process known from D1 (see Box VIII). Such automation is considered a matter of standard procedure for a programmer given the specifications.

However, in combination with claim 2, the technical effect of the feature is an automatic evaluation of user's performance.

Consequently, with the background of D1, the skilled person is posed with the problem to provide an automated evaluation of the user's performance.

D2 discloses a method for task assignment using gamification techniques (see abstract) where a user/talent is automatically assigned a score based on various criteria associated with the task and the user performance to award the user/talent for completing a task associated with a work request (see [0020] and [0121]). The criteria can be e.g. speed and efficiency of the user and measure of complexity of the work.

With the background of D1, the person skilled in the art posed with the problem to provide an automated evaluation of the user's performance would apply the method disclosed in D2

.../...

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: Box No. V

to determine at the TRM computing system a task score, based on criteria associated with the task and abilities of the user and thereby arrive at the claimed invention.

Based on the above, the subject matter of claim 1 is novel but does not involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

Independent claims 13 and 14

The subject matter of the independent claim 14 lacks technical character and is, thus, not an invention within the meaning of PCT Rule 67, see Box VIII.

Independent claims 13 and 14 relate to a security system and a computer program product comprising features corresponding to the features defined by the method claim 1.

Objections similar to those with regards to claim 1 are thus applicable to these claims.

Therefore, the subject matter of claims 13 and 14 is novel but does not involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

Claim 2

The feature of claim 2 is known from D2 where the game score for the work request is displayed to the user via a dashboard (see [0027] and figure 5M).

Therefore, the subject matter of claim 2 is novel but does not involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

Claims 3 and 4

It is known from D2 that a total game score is calculated for the talent/user by combining the game points awarded for all the work requests associated with each user of talent device (see [0121]). The score for each talent rates the strength of the talents performance/deliverable against the gaming guidelines and points can be assigned depending on the level of importance (see [0122]-[0125]). Moreover, it is known from D1 that a user's skill level may be determined as part of the review or feedback process [see [0034]]. These features are considered to correspond to the features of claim 3.

It is further known from D2 that the game score is displayed in the talent device (see figure 5E and 6I) according to claim 4.

Therefore, the subject matter of claims 3 and 4 is novel but does not involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

Claim 5

The feature of claim 5 is known from D1 and D2 where assignment of a task to a talent/user is based on the talent's/user's skill score (see D1 [0063] and D2 [0088]).

.../...

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: **Box No. V**

Therefore, the subject matter of claim 5 is novel but does not involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

Claims 6 and 7

The features of claims 6 and 7 are known from D2, where the gaming score generated when a task is completed can be based on e.g. feedback information, quantitative rating (see [0014], complexity of the work request, game points awarded for actual hours accrued for performing work associated with the work request, game points awarded based on a measure of quality of the deliverables, game points awarded based on a timing of deliverables relative to deadlines and other gaming rules (see [0026]).

Therefore, the subject matter of claim 6 and 7 is novel but does not involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

Claims 8 and 10

Claims 8 and 10 relate to the receiving of the feedback information.

It is known from D2 that the feedback information is provided by a project manager (PM) (see [0120]).

It is further known from D2 that the feedback is received via a PM interface or the talent sourcing server (see [0032]).

Therefore, the subject matter of claims 8 and 10 is novel but does not involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

Claim 9

According to D2, a talent/user may log into the talent sourcing application disclosed (see [0066]). This is read as the talent consents to participation in the gamification of the application according to claim 9.

Therefore, the subject matter of claim 9 is novel but does not involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

Claims 11 and 12

The dependent claims 11 and 12 involve measures obvious to a person skilled in the art. Therefore, these claims lack an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

Summary

The subject matter of claims 1-14 is novel but is not considered to involve an inventive step. The subject matter of all claims is industrially applicable.

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

The present application does not meet the requirement of Article 6 PCT for the following reasons:

- The feature of determining, at the server, a score of performance of the task for the first user based on the task, the task skill level and the user skill level lacks technical effect and does not contribute to the solution of the invention as defined by claim 1. It is not clear from the claim how the determined score is applied in the system.
- It is not clear how to determine a score of performance based on the task.

The subject matter of the claim 14 lacks technical character and is, thus, not an invention within the meaning of PCT Rule 67. Claim 14 discloses a computer program product comprising code applying verification of computing device provided by a security system. A computer program as such lacks technical character and is not an invention within the meaning of PCT Rule 67. Therefore, the current wording of said claim only discloses a computer program product comprising a non-transitory computer readable medium storing a computer program.

Claim 14 is interpreted as the said computer program product comprising code with instructions which when being executed by the security system causes said security system to perform the method according to claim 1.