

TRANSLATION

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference hw2018047	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See Form PCT/IPEA/416
International application No. PCT/CN2018/099768	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 09.08.2018	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 10.08.2017
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC G06Q10/06 (2012.01) i		
Applicant CHENGDU QIANNIUCAO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CO. , LTD.		

1. This report is the international preliminary examination report, established by this International Preliminary Examining Authority under Article 35 and transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.
2. This REPORT consists of a total of <u>9</u> sheets, including this cover sheet.
3. This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, comprising: a. ☐ (<i>sent to the applicant and to the International Bureau</i>) a total of _____ sheets, as follows: ☐ sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority, unless those sheets were superseded or cancelled, and any accompanying letters (see Rules 46.5, 66.8, 70.16, 91.2, and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions). ☐ sheets containing rectifications, where the decision was made by this Authority not to take them into account because they were not authorized by or notified to this Authority at the time when this Authority began to draw up this report, and any accompanying letters (Rules 66.4bis, 70.2(e), 70.16 and 91.2). ☐ superseded sheets and any accompanying letters, where this Authority either considers that the superseding sheets contain an amendment that goes beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed, or the superseding sheets were not accompanied by a letter indicating the basis for the amendments in the application as filed, as indicated in item 4 of Box No. I and the Supplemental Box (see Rule 70.16(b)) b. ☐ (<i>sent to the International Bureau only</i>) a total of (indicate type and number of electronic carrier(s)) _____, containing a sequence listing, in the form of an Annex C/ST.25 text file, as indicated in the Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing (see paragraph 3ter of Annex C of the Administrative Instructions).
4. This report contains indications relating to the following items: ☒ Box No. I Basis of the report ☒ 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 Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or 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

Date of submission of the demand	Date of completion of this report
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/CN	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No.

PCT/CN2018/099768

Box No. I Basis of the report

- With regard to the **language**, this report is based on:
- ☒ 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))
 - ☐ publication of the international application (Rule 12.4(a))
 - ☐ international preliminary examination (Rule 55.2(a) and/or 55.3(a))
 - With regard to the **elements** of the international application, this report is based on (*replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report*):

☒ the international application as originally filed/furnished
☐ the description:
 - pages _____ as originally filed/furnished.
 - pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
 - pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____☐ the claims:
 - Nos. _____ as originally filed/furnished.
 - Nos.* _____ as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
 - Nos.* _____ received by this Authority on _____☐ the drawings:
 - pages _____ as originally filed/furnished.
 - pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
 - pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____☐ a sequence listing – see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.
 - ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:
 - ☐ the description, pages _____
 - ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
 - ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____
 - ☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____
 - ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments annexed to this report and listed below had not been made, since either they are considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, or they were not accompanied by a letter indicating the basis for the amendments in the application as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c) and (c-bis)):
 - ☐ the description, pages _____
 - ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
 - ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____
 - ☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____
 - ☐ This report has been established:
 - ☐ taking into account **the rectification of an obvious mistake** authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rules 66.1(d-bis) and 70.2(e)).
 - ☐ without taking into account **the rectification of an obvious mistake** authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rules 66.1bis and 70.2(e)).
 - With regard to top-up searches (Rules 66.1ter and 70.2(f)):

☐ A top-up search was carried out by this Authority on _____
☐ Additional relevant documents have been discovered during the top-up search.
☐ No top-up search was carried out by this Authority because it would serve no useful purpose.
 - ☐ Supplementary international search report(s) from Authority(ies) _____
☐ has/have been received and taken into account in establishing this report (Rule 45bis.8(b) and (c)).
- If item 4 applies, some or all of those sheets may be marked "superseded."*

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No.

PCT/CN2018/099768

Box No. II**Priority**

1. ☐ This report has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the failure to furnish within the prescribed time limit the requested:

☐ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 66.7(a)).
☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 66.7(b)).
2. ☐ This report has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rule 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this report, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:
Upon verification, the priority claim of the present application is established.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No.

PCT/CN2018/099768

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-10	YES
	Claims	None	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	None	YES
	Claims	1-10	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-10	YES
	Claims	None	NO

2. Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7)

I. Documents cited

D1: CN 106485388 A 08 March 2017

II. Novelty and inventive step

D1 discloses a permissions management method for a service approval system (see claims 1-12), comprising: configuration data for usage permissions of a login account is acquired (equivalent to selecting a user in a system); a setting for role information of the login account is received; a permissions configuration template for the role information is output, usage permissions in accordance with the scope of the duties of the role being preset in the permissions configuration template (equivalent to displaying current usage states corresponding to each approval process for the selected user); and on the basis of the configuration data, service approval system usage permissions of the login account are generated (equivalent to authorizing usage permissions of the approval processes for the selected

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No.

PCT/CN2018/099768

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

user).

Claim 1 differs from D1 in that: (1) all approval processes in the system are displayed. Claim 9 differs from D1 in that: (2) the user is a department manager, and all approval nodes of all approval processes in the system are displayed.

Therefore, claims 1 and 9 and dependent claims 2-8 and 10 thereof comply with PCT Article 33(2).

With regard to differences (1) and (2), to display all approval processes and approval nodes in a system is a customary means in the present field for implementing information display in order to facilitate user configuration during permissions configuration. Under normal circumstances only department managers have management permissions, and to set a user specifically as a department manager is a common mode of implementing permissions management.

Therefore, on the basis of D1 combined with customary means in the present field, it can be seen that claims 1 and 9 do not comply with PCT Article 33(3).

Claims 2-8 and 10 directly or indirectly refer to claims 1 and 9, and the additional technical features of said claims are customary means for implementing permissions exclusivity setting, user role association, permissions state display, and interactive information display. Claims 2-8 and 10 therefore do not comply with PCT Article 33(3).

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

III. Industrial applicability

Claims 1-10 are industrially applicable in the technical field of access control, and thus comply with PCT Article 33(4).

IV. Regarding the statement of opinion of the applicant

1. The applicant believes that: in the solution of reference document 1, only a portion of permissions in the system are displayed during authorization. When performing authorization for a user, all approval processes (all such processes that an authorized operator has the authority to authorize/operate) and the current permission states for each approval process of the user are displayed. In the present application, because all approval processes and the current usage permission states for each approval process of the user are displayed, the authorized operator need only perform modification on such basis during authorization. In reference document 1 however, if a login account has other permissions beyond the permissions displayed, corresponding processes must still be found one at a time, and then authorization must be performed for the login account.

The examiner believes that: firstly, the difference between displaying "a portion of permissions" and displaying "all permissions" lies in a difference in the displaying of permissions content. To display a portion of content or the entirety of content at a point in the course of an application is a common mode of real-time

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

information display employed by persons skilled in the art, and a person skilled in the art could design such on the basis of actual application requirements. Secondly, in the field of permissions control, conventional permissions configuration requires manger permissions, and the object of the display of all approval processes and permission states in the present application ought to be an object having manager permissions. Therefore, it is not the case that accounts in the present application do not require authorization after logging in. In addition, because display of a portion or the entirety of permissions on a permissions management control page is a common means in the present field, the permissions configuration template disclosed in reference document 1 may be set to display all approval processes and permissions, and different permissions configuration pages may also be set on the basis of actual user requirements. The template need not be defined as displaying a portion of permissions.

2. The applicant believes that: in the present application, during authorization, displaying all approval processes in a system after a user is selected causes approval processes to not be omitted in the authorization process, thereby facilitating rapid authorization of related permissions for the user. Most importantly, permissions adjustment for the user on all approval processes in the system can be completed in one authorization operation. In a conventional system, as soon as approval processes are selected manually, not only can permissions adjustment for the user on all approval processes in the system not be completed in one

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No.

PCT/CN2018/099768

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

authorization operation, but omissions, mis-selections, or repeated selections in the authorization process are possible, such a system thus being complicated to operate and prone to error, while also having large workloads and low efficiency. At the same time, displaying current usage permission states for each approval process of the selected user when displaying all approval processes in a system after a user is selected facilitates modification on such basis by an authorized operator, allowing for approval process authorization to be performed rapidly for the user, improving authorization efficiency and decreasing the error rate of authorization.

The examiner believes that: in the field of display control, complete display and partial display each have respective advantages and disadvantages, which is common general knowledge in the present field. Complete display of data is able to ensure completeness of content, but for a user, portions not requiring modification of permissions configuration would be a matter of redundant information, information that interferes with the ability of the user to accurately locate permissions requiring modification. Partial display of permissions requiring modification by the user provides the user with concise and efficient data, saving time for the user. A person skilled in the art could flexibly configure the displayed content of a permissions configuration page on the basis of actual application requirements, and partial display, complete display, and configurable display are all customary means in the present field.

3. The applicant believes that: a core feature of the

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No.

PCT/CN2018/099768

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

present application is that "every role is an independent individual, rather than a group/class, one role only being able to be associated with a single user at one time". When a certain role is associated with a user, other users then are not able to be associated with said role. One role is not permitted to be associated with multiple users at the same time. In reference document 1, however, a conventional RBAC permissions and access control mechanism is used, conventional roles to users simultaneously having one-to-one and one-to-many states.

The examiner believes that: the statement of opinion of the applicant lacks a factual basis. Claim 3 recites, "the approval node comprises one or a plurality of approvers, and custom setting is performed on form field operation permissions of all approvers in the approval node, said form field operation permissions being permissions in a process and not in a system, and the form field operation permissions of each approver being independent", and it is not defined in the application that "one role is only able to be associated with a single user at one time". Taking a step back, even if the applicant were to add "one role is only able to be associated with a single user at one time" into the claims, because one-to-one and one-to-many association between users and roles are both common permissions control rules in the present field, doing so would not cause the claims to involve an inventive step. Therefore, the statement of opinion of the applicant is not persuasive.