



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

Table with 5 columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO. Includes application details for Cherry Ann Alib-Bulatao and examination information for Examiner Bahl, Sangeeta.

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):

- DDay@KragLaw.com
MPusti@KragLaw.com
PTOMail@KragLaw.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* CHERRY ANN ALIB-BULATAO, TEDDY T. CAGUIOA,  
EVAN MARK GOLDBERG, and BRAD STOUTIMORE

---

Appeal 2020-001435  
Application 13/893,053  
Technology Center 3600

---

Before ERIC B. GRIMES, RICHARD M. LEBOVITZ, and  
JEFFREY N. FREDMAN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

FREDMAN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal<sup>1,2</sup> under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) involving claims to a method of providing information contained in a multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system to a user. The Examiner rejected the claims as obvious. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b). We affirm.

---

<sup>1</sup> We use the word “Appellant” to refer to “applicant” as defined in 37 C.F.R. § 1.42. Appellant identifies the Real Party in Interest as Oracle International Corporation (*see* Appeal Br. 2).

<sup>2</sup> We have considered and herein refer to the Specification of May 13, 2013 (“Spec.”); Final Office Action of Dec. 10, 2018 (“Final Act.”); Appeal Brief of Aug. 12, 2019 (“Appeal Br.”); Examiner’s Answer of Oct. 16, 2019 (“Ans.”); and Reply Brief of Dec. 16, 2019 (“Reply Br.”).

*Statement of the Case*

*Background*

“[S]ubstantial efforts have been directed to Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems that integrate the capabilities of several historically separate business computing system into a common system, with a view toward streamlining business processes and increasing efficiencies on a business-wide level” (Spec. ¶ 2). “[S]ubstantial efforts have also been directed to integrated Customer Relationship Management (CRM) systems, with a view toward obtaining a better understanding of customers, enhancing service to existing customers, and acquiring new, profitable customers” (*id.* ¶ 3). The Specification teaches “a variety of client applications . . . incorporating and/or incorporated into a variety of client computing devices 104 may communicate with a multi-tenant enterprise information system 108” (*id.* ¶ 4).

“In order to improve efficiency and facilitate an employee’s role within an organization, it would be advantageous to be able [to] automatically provide users of the multitenant enterprise information system 108 with notifications and/or updates to the information stored in that multi-tenant data processing platform, where those notifications and/or updates are specific to a particular user’s role within the enterprise” (Spec. ¶ 9).

*The Claims*

Claims 1–5, 7–10, 12–17, 19, and 20 are on appeal. We note that Appellant does not argue the claims separately (*see* Appeal Br. 29), so dependent claims stand or fall with claim 1 because separate reasons for their patentability were not provided in the Appeal Brief. 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv).

Independent claim 1 is representative and is reproduced below with bracketing added to identify claim limitations:

1. [Pre] A method of providing information contained in a multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system to a user of the multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system, comprising:

[a] generating a profile for the user defining the information and including: (i) a set of rules for a plurality of business applications of the multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system, each of the set of rules corresponding to at least one business application of the multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system, (ii) a project associated with a record that is modified as part of the project, and (iii) a condition input by the user to control a format of the information contained in the multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system that is provided to the user;

[b] detecting a change to information included in the record for the project specified by the user, wherein the record is stored in one or more databases interconnected to the business applications of the multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system, wherein the change is implemented in response to an instruction from at least one of the business applications as a result of user input into at least one of the business applications of the multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system;

[c] evaluating the set of rules to determine if the detected change satisfies a trigger condition defined by the set of rules;

[d] accessing the information that was changed in the business applications of the multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system in response to a determination that the detected change satisfies the trigger condition defined by the set of rules;

[e] formatting at least a portion of the information that was changed in accordance with the condition input by the user and contained in the profile; and

[f] controlling transmission of the formatted information that was changed to a third-party social application, wherein the third-party social application is separate from the multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system, thereby bypassing the multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system to distribute the information that was changed to the user via a channel for the project, wherein the channel for the project is associated with the third-party social application outside of an environment of the multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system, allowing the user to view the formatted portion of the information without leaving the third-party social application.

*The Rejection*<sup>3</sup>

The Examiner rejected claims 1–5, 7–10, 12–17, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Kemp<sup>4</sup> and Ramsay<sup>5</sup> (Final Act. 9–21).

The Examiner finds Kemp teaches most of the claimed elements (*see* Final Act. 9–12) but finds Kemp does not specifically teach the limitation “detecting a change to information included in the record, wherein the record is stored in one or more databases interconnected to the business applications of the multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system” (*id.* at 13, italics omitted). The Examiner finds Ramsay teaches this limitation, citing various portions of Ramsay (*id.*). The Examiner finds the

---

<sup>3</sup> We note that the Examiner withdrew the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 in the Examiner’s Answer (*see* Ans. 3).

<sup>4</sup> Kemp et al., US 2012/0102063 A1, published Apr. 26, 2012.

<sup>5</sup> Ramsay, Jr. et al., US 8,145,678 B2, issued Mar. 27, 2012. The parties refer to this reference as “Ramsay” so we shall do so as well.

combination obvious “for the motivation of providing informational feeds and commenting functionality to users of a social computing environment” (*id.*, citing Ramsay 2:16–24).

The issue with respect to this rejection is: Does a preponderance of the evidence of record support the Examiner’s conclusion that Kemp and Ramsay render claim 1 obvious?

*Findings of Fact*

1. Kemp teaches, regarding the preamble, “providing information updates in an information feed system and, more specifically, . . . techniques for analyzing and responding to information updates” (Kemp ¶ 3). Kemp teaches that “products may be configured or designed for use in a multi-tenant database environment” (Kemp ¶ 40). Kemp explains that the “term ‘multi-tenant database system’ can refer to those systems in which various elements of hardware and software of the database system may be shared by one or more customers” (Kemp ¶ 58).

2. Kemp teaches, regarding the user profile in step (a), that a “‘user profile’ or ‘user’s profile’ is generally configured to store and maintain data about the user of the database system” (Kemp ¶ 59). Kemp teaches that “different users will have different capabilities with regard to accessing and modifying application and database information, depending on a user’s security or permission level, also called authorization” (Kemp ¶ 74).

3. Kemp teaches, regarding the set of rules in step (a)(i), “security rules for determining whether a user has access to a record can be performed in a variety of ways . . . For example, a security level table can specify

whether a user can see a particular type of record and/or particular records”

(Kemp ¶ 237). Kemp teaches:

In some implementations, a subscription center acts as a centralized place in a database application (e.g. application platform 18) to manage which records a user subscribes to, and which field updates the user wants to see in feed tracked updates. The subscription center can use a subscription table to keep track of the subscriptions of various users. In one implementation, the subscription center shows a list of all the items (users and records) a user is subscribed to.

(Kemp ¶ 245).

4. Kemp teaches, regarding the modified project records in step (a)(ii), that “a user of a database system may not easily know when important information in the database has changed, e.g., about a project . . . Implementations can provide feed tracked updates about such changes and other events, thereby keeping users informed” (Kemp ¶ 67).

5. Kemp teaches, regarding the information format control by user in step (a)(iii), that:

In another implementation, the user can specify how the feed tracked updates are to be displayed and/or sent to the user. For example, a user can specify a font for the text, a location of where the feed can be selected and displayed, amount of text to be displayed, and other text or symbols to be displayed (e.g. importance flags).

(Kemp ¶ 137).

6. Kemp teaches, regarding step (b), that “‘following’ of a database record . . . allows a user to track the progress of that record. Updates to the record, also referred to herein as changes, can occur and be noted on an information feed such as the record feed or the news feed of a user subscribed to the record” (Kemp ¶ 39). Kemp teaches “[t]ypes of such

updates can include field changes in a data record, posts such as explicit text or characters submitted by a user” (*id.*). Kemp teaches “[i]n another implementation, feed items in a profile feed could include posts made by the particular user and feed tracked changes (feed tracked updates) initiated based on actions of the particular user” (Kemp ¶ 65).

7. Kemp teaches, regarding step (c), that a “determination may be made as to whether the selected information update includes information satisfying a trigger condition associated with the data object creation rule” (Kemp ¶ 45; *cf.* Kemp ¶ 253 (“In one implementation, this determination can occur by first obtaining the criteria and then determining objects that satisfy the criteria.”)).

8. Kemp teaches, regarding step (d), that “[i]n some implementations, a designated action may be performed for an information update when a trigger condition is detected. The action may include . . . creating a new information update” (Kemp ¶ 44).

9. Kemp teaches, regarding step (e), that “a trigger rule may be configured to translate an information update from one language (e.g., English) to another language (e.g., French) when the system detects that the information update includes the text string ‘&translate’” (Kemp ¶ 47; *cf.* Kemp ¶ 137 (“the user can specify how the feed tracked updates are to be displayed and/or sent to the user. For example, a user can specify a font for the text”)).

10. Kemp teaches, regarding step (f), “creating an information update in a social networking system accessible via a network such as the Internet (e.g., T wittet®), or performing any other action capable of being performed by the system,” thereby allowing users to view the information on

a third party social application, rather than the tenant integrated information system (*see* Kemp ¶ 44).

11. Ramsay teaches “an enterprise-based social computing system [that] can be configured to provide event feeds to social networking application users” (Ramsay 2:28–30).

12. Ramsay teaches, regarding step (b), that:

Components of the system **100** can operate to collect and filter information (e.g., user events) associated with one or more enterprise users including information associated with a task, announcement assignment, a comment, and/or other operation within the enterprise. For example, information associated with an employee promotion, an employee anniversary, employee comment, a completed project or milestone, posted information, etc. can be collected from one or more back-end systems and used in part to generate one or more events for one or more event feeds.

(Ramsay 5:52–61).

13. Ramsay teaches, regarding step (b), that “retrieved events are communicated to the events pool **604**. For example, the events pool **604** can include one or more database systems” (Ramsay 20:36–38).

### *Principles of Law*

“The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results.”

*KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 416 (2007).

### *Analysis*

We adopt the Examiner’s findings of fact and reasoning regarding the scope and content of the prior art (Final Act. 9–21; FF 1–13) and agree that the claims are obvious over Kemp and Ramsay. We address Appellant’s arguments below.

Appellant contends:

The combination of Kemp and Ramsay fails to teach, or render obvious, detecting and controlling the transmission of changed information included in a record for a project stored in one or more databases connected to a multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system, and transmitting that changed information to a third-party social application.

(Appeal Br. 30). Appellant contends “Kemp does not disclose detecting a change in a record for a project stored in one or more databases connected to a multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system, which is subsequently formatted and transmitted to a social application” (*id.*). Appellant contends “[h]owever, Ramsay, like Kemp, does not teach detecting, formatting and transmitting changed information in a record for a project included in a database of a multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system to a third-party social application” (*id.*). Lastly, Appellant contends “Ramsay also fails to teach detecting a change to information included in one or more databases interconnected to business applications of a multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system, and formatting and controlling transmission of the changed information to a social application as recited in claim 1” (*id.* at 31).

We are not persuaded by these arguments because “the test [for obviousness] is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art.” *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 425 (CCPA 1981). Appellant argues the references separately contending that neither Kemp or Ramsay individually teach all the elements of claim 1. However, “[n]on-obviousness cannot be established by attacking references individually where the rejection is based upon the teachings of a combination of references.” *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 1097 (Fed.

Cir. 1986). In determining obviousness, furthermore, a reference “must be read, not in isolation, but for what it fairly teaches in combination with the prior art as a whole.” *Id.*

We agree with the Examiner that Kemp teaches an integrated multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system (FF 1–5, 7–10), and relevant to the “detecting a change to information” limitation, Kemp teaches that “‘following’ of a database record . . . allows a user to track the progress of that record” and that “changes, can occur and be noted on an information feed such as the record feed or the news feed of a user subscribed to the record” (FF 6). Kemp further explains that “feed items in a profile feed could include posts made by the particular user and feed tracked changes (feed tracked updates) initiated based on actions of the particular user” (*id.*). Thus, Kemp describes step [b] of claim 1 of detecting changes in a database record (FF 10).

As to Appellant’s argument regarding “formatting and controlling transmission” of steps [e] and [f] of the claims (Appeal Br. 31), Kemp also explains that “the user can specify how the feed tracked updates are to be displayed and/or sent to the user. For example, a user can specify a font for the text” (FF 9).

Thus, Kemp recognizes that changes can be detected and noted on the information feed and that the changes can be controlled by users and based on user actions (FF 6, 10) as required by claim 1. Further, Kemp teaches that “products may be configured or designed for use in a multi-tenant database environment” (FF 1).

However, the Examiner acknowledges that “Kemp does not specifically teach . . . wherein the record is stored in one or more databases

*interconnected to the business applications of the multi-tenant integrated enterprise information system” (Final Act. 13).*

Ramsay teaches system components that “can operate to collect and filter information (e.g., user events) associated with one or more enterprise users including information associated with a task” and teaches that such information “can be collected from one or more back-end systems and used in part to generate one or more events for one or more event feeds” (FF 12). Ramsay explains that “retrieved events are communicated to the events pool **604**. For example, the events pool **604** can include one or more database systems” (FF 13). Thus, Ramsay teaches collecting information from back-end systems that are interconnected with databases in the enterprise (multi-tenant) information system.

We agree with the Examiner that it would have been obvious to incorporate the interconnected record storage system of Ramsay with the multi-tenant database environment of Kemp in order to provide “informational feeds and commenting functionality to users of a social computing environment” (Final Act. 13, citing Ramsay 2:16–24).

### *Conclusion of Law*

A preponderance of the evidence of record supports the Examiner’s conclusion that Kemp and Ramsay render claim 1 obvious.

## CONCLUSION

In summary:

<b>Claims Rejected</b>	<b>35 U.S.C. §</b>	<b>Reference(s)/Basis</b>	<b>Affirmed</b>	<b>Reversed</b>
1–5, 7–10, 12–17, 19, 20	103(a)	Ramsay, Kemp	1–5, 7–10, 12–17, 19, 20	

Appeal 2020-001435  
Application 13/893,053

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

AFFIRMED