

Claim Chart for BlueSpace Mail Documents (EX2004 & EX2006)

'217 Patent Claims

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
1. A computer-implemented system for determining a relevance score of a piece of electronic content sent from a sender to a user,	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a computer-implemented system for determining a relevance score of a piece of electronic content sent from a sender to a user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes a “computer-implemented system”: “SMTP treats each email as a string of text similar to a postcard or telegram that must be passed <u>between computers</u> until it reaches its desired recipients.” EX2004, at 5 (emphasis added). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes “a piece of electronic content sent from a sender to a user.” EX2004, at 14 (referring to “both <u>sent</u> and <u>received</u>” “content” (emphasis added)); <i>id.</i> at 21 (referring to “the <u>sender</u> and each <u>recipient</u> of the TransMail” (emphasis added)). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes determining a “relevance score of a piece of electronic content”: • “BlueSpace uses a multi-dimensional <u>relevance</u> system, that <u>rates</u> the <u>importance</u> of each <u>piece of content</u>” EX2004, at 4. • “<u>Each piece of content</u> (submessage) can be presented to the user along with a slider that indicates its current <u>relevance score</u>.” EX2004, at 17 (emphasis added).
the relevance score determined with respect to the user,	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the relevance score being determined with respect to the user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that the relevance score is determined with respect to the user: • “[<u>T</u>he end user [is] able to affect <u>relevance</u> directly <u>for their own inbox</u>.” EX2004, at 17 (emphasis added). • “Importance ... is stored <u>with respect to each user</u>.” <i>Id.</i> (emphasis added).

‘217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
the computer-implemented system comprising: a computer processor; and	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the computer-implemented system comprising a computer processor. The computer-implemented systems described in the documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, runs on a computer processor. For example, both the BlueSpace TransMail system and applying a relevance system to blogs are computer-implemented systems that include a computer processor. <i>See generally</i> EX2004 (describing the BlueSpace TransMail system); EX2006, at 51 (describing applying the relevance system to the environment of blogs that are delivered like newsletters to subscribers).
a computer-readable storage medium storing computer program modules configured to execute on the computer processor,	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the computer-implemented system comprising a computer-readable storage medium storing computer program modules configured to execute on the computer processor. The computer-implemented systems described in the documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, include a computer-readable storage medium storing computer program modules configured to execute on the computer processor. For example, both the BlueSpace TransMail system and applying a relevance system to blogs are computer-implemented systems that include a computer-readable storage medium storing computer program modules configured to execute on the computer processor. <i>See generally</i> EX2004 (describing the BlueSpace TransMail system); <i>see also</i> EX2006, at 51 (describing applying the relevance system to the environment of blogs that are delivered like newsletters to subscribers); EX2004, at 6 (discussing running “the BlueSpace TransMail application”). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes algorithms. <i>E.g.</i>, EX2004, at 28-32 (“8. Algorithms.”); EX2006, at 52-56 (“9. Algorithms.”). A skilled artisan would understand that these algorithms are implemented using software – i.e., “computer program modules” stored on “a computer-readable storage medium” and “configured to execute on the computer processor.” A skilled artisan would understand that “computer program modules” is software.

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
the computer program modules comprising: a monitoring module configured to track actions by a plurality of users associated with an application for managing electronic content;	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a monitoring module configured to track actions by a plurality of users associated with an application for managing electronic content. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes tracking actions by a plurality of users associated with an application for managing electronic content: • “The granularity of this architecture allows the application to <u>record all actions by users</u> in the system, ensuring that the application has audited the entire lifecycle of the content.” EX2004, at 18 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace is able to <u>track what happens to content</u> during its lifecycle.” EX2004, at 6 (emphasis added). • “Mail actions inputs – the <u>user actions recorded</u> by the system.” EX2004, at 13 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace <u>audits</u> all significant <u>user actions</u> inside a BlueSpace system.” EX2004, at 14 (emphasis added). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes algorithms. EX2004, at 28-32 (“8. Algorithms.”); EX2006, at 52-56 (“9. Algorithms.”). A skilled artisan would understand that these algorithms are implemented using software – i.e., “computer program modules” stored on “a computer-readable storage medium” and “configured to execute on the computer processor.” A skilled artisan would understand that a “monitoring module” is software.

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
a first relevance measurement module coupled to the monitoring module and configured to determine a first measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content based at least in part on one or more actions of the user on the piece of electronic content;	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a first relevance measurement module coupled to the monitoring module and configured to determine a first measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content based at least in part on one or more actions of the user on the piece of electronic content. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes monitoring actions of the user on the piece of electronic content (and using those actions as an input to a relevance algorithm to rate the importance of the content): • “BlueSpace uses a multi-dimensional relevance system, that rates the importance of each piece of content <u>based on</u> the following criteria: 1. <u>User actions – what did the user do with the mail?</u> If they moved it to a folder or forwarded it then it is likely to be if significant importance.” EX2004, at 4 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace can take <u>direct user input</u> to help determine relevance.” EX2004, at 17 (emphasis added). • “Mail actions relevance relies on the <u>user’s actions</u> to help determine content’s relevance for content in all the user’s mail folders – both sent and received.” EX2004, at 14 (emphasis added). • “a <u>user’s own actions</u> can be used as an input to a relevance algorithm.” EX2004, at 14 & EX2006, at 18 (emphasis added). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes algorithms for determining a measure of relevance based on the user’s actions: “a user’s own actions can be used as an input to a relevance algorithm.” EX2004, at 14; EX2006, at 18; see also EX2004, at 28-32 (“8. Algorithms.”); EX2006, at 52-56 (“9. Algorithms.”). A skilled artisan would understand that these algorithms are implemented using software – i.e., “computer program modules” stored on “a computer-readable storage medium” and “configured to execute on the computer processor.” A skilled artisan would understand that a “first relevance measurement module” is software. A skilled artisan would understand from the documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, that a first relevance measurement module is coupled to the monitoring module because the documentation describes that data captured through the software/algorithms for monitoring user actions is provided to relevance algorithms: “Each piece of content is audited and managed through its lifecycle in the mail system, and every significant user action is audited. This provides a powerful set of raw data that can be used in relevance algorithms.” EX2004, at 4; EX2006, at 5.

a second relevance measurement module coupled to the monitoring module and configured to: identify at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user, and	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second relevance measurement module coupled to the monitoring module and configured to identify at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user and determine a second measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content as based at least in part on one or more measures derived from the group below. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes identifying at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user: • “Mail actions collaborative relevance relies on <u>the actions of other users</u> to determine the relevance of content in a given user’s folders – both sent and <u>received</u>.” EX2004, at 15 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace uses a multi-dimensional relevance system, that rates the importance of <u>each piece of content</u> based on the following criteria: ...2. User collaborative actions – <u>what did other users do with the mail?</u> Again, their actions indicate their views on the content’s importance.” EX2004, at 4 (emphasis added). • “Mail actions collaborative relevance – scenarios involving other users’ actions to determine content relevance.” EX2004, at 13. • “In the following scenarios, <u>other users’ actions</u> can be used to help <u>determine the relevance of content to a given user</u>: ... If a user sends a TransMail to a group of users, and most reply to it, forward it or copy it to custom folders, it is more likely to be relevant than if they all delete it immediately.... If the vast majority of the users in a given department read a piece of content sent globally, then the content is likely to be relevant to another user in that department.” EX2004, at 15-16. • “Actions – users’ actions determine both relevance and importance values. Both direct user’s actions and <u>collaborative actions (actions of other users on the same content) are taken into account</u>.” EX2006, at 58 (emphasis added). • “For example, one HR employee is generally likely to have similar importance to another one, especially if they are of similar position in a tree structure – e.g. they both work in employee appraisal form processing. There are clearly exceptions to this trend, but in most organizations it is likely to have a positive affect on the initial states of importance.” EX2006, at 22. • “Note that if required, branched structures – such as knowledge taxonomies for contexts, directories for users and Jobcode hierarchies – can be used as a correlative basis for importance on an ongoing basis. Thus for example, an importance change for one user would have <u>a cascading ‘ripple effect’ for similar users</u>.” EX2006, at 22 (emphasis added). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes algorithms for determining a measure of relevance. EX2004, at 28-32 (“8. Algorithms.”); EX2006, at 52-56 (“9. Algorithms.”). A skilled artisan would understand that these algorithms are implemented using software – i.e., “computer program modules” stored on “a
--	---

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
	computer-readable storage medium” and “configured to execute on the computer processor.” A skilled artisan would understand that “a second relevance measurement module” is software. A skilled artisan would understand from the documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, that a second relevance measurement module coupled to the monitoring module because the documentation describes that data captured through the software/algorithms for monitoring user actions is provided to relevance algorithms: “Each piece of content is audited and managed through its lifecycle in the mail system, and every significant user action is audited. This provides a powerful set of raw data that can be used in relevance algorithms.” EX2004, at 4; EX2006, at 5.
determine a second measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content as based at least in part on one or more measures derived from the group consisting of:	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second relevance measurement module coupled to the monitoring module and configured to determine a second measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content as based at least in part on one or more measures derived from the group below. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes measures of relevance based on the measures derived from the group below, as set forth below:
a local importance describing an importance of the sender to the user,	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content based at least in part on one or more measures that include a local importance describing an importance of the sender to the user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that a measure of relevance can be the importance of the sender to the user: • “Allow <u>user to rate senders</u> with a relevance score.” EX2004, at 27 (emphasis added). • “A user can interact with the relevance results by changing a ‘slider’ (graphical element) on a ... per sender basis, to help the system learn.” EX2004, at 4. • “Consider the following user action scenarios, in which a <u>user’s own actions</u> can be used as an input to a relevance algorithm: ... - If a user always deletes content <u>from a specific user</u> quickly, then it is <u>unlikely</u> that any <u>content from this user is of significant relevance to them</u>. - If a user always reads content from <u>another specific user</u> before reading content from other users in any given new set of new mail received into their inbox, then it is likely that <u>content from this specific user is of significant relevance</u>.” EX2004, at 14 (emphasis added).

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
a global importance describing an importance of the sender within an organization with which the plurality of users are associated,	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content based at least in part on one or more measures that include a global importance describing an importance of the sender within an organization with which the plurality of users are associated. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that a measure of relevance can be the importance of the sender within an organization with which the plurality of users are associated: • “[R]elevance is not a purely user-centric phenomenon – a separate question relates to <u>relevance for the entire enterprise</u>.” EX2004, at 17 (emphasis added). • “In the following scenarios, <u>other users’ actions</u> can be used to help <u>determine the relevance</u> of content to a given user: ... If <u>most users read content from a particular author (e.g. the CEO), then content from this author is typically of greater relevance</u> than content from a different author that no-one ever reads.” EX2004, at 15-16 (emphasis added).
a content relevance determined responsive to content of the piece of electronic content, and	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content based at least in part on one or more measures that include a content relevance determined responsive to content of the piece of electronic content. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that a measure of relevance can be the content of the piece of electronic content: • “In the following scenarios, other users’ actions can be used <u>to help determine the relevance</u> of content to a given user: ... If the majority of other users tend to read <u>content linked to a particular context</u>, then <u>content</u> attached to that context is <u>more likely to be relevant</u> to the user in question.” EX2004, at 16 (emphasis added).

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
one or more actions on the piece of electronic content of the at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user; and	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content based at least in part on one or more measures that include one or more actions on the piece of electronic content of the at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that a measure of relevance can be actions on the piece of electronic content of the at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user”: • “Mail actions collaborative relevance relies on <u>the actions of other users</u> to determine the relevance of content in a given user’s folders – both sent and <u>received</u>.” EX2004, at 15 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace uses a multi-dimensional relevance system, that rates the importance of <u>each piece of content</u> based on the following criteria: ...2. User collaborative actions – <u>what did other users do with the mail?</u> Again, their actions indicate their views on the content’s importance.” EX2004, at 4 (emphasis added). • “Mail actions <u>collaborative relevance</u> – scenarios involving <u>other users’ actions</u> to determine content relevance.” EX2004, at 13. • “In the following scenarios, <u>other users’ actions</u> can be used to help <u>determine</u> the <u>relevance of content to a given user</u>: ... If a user sends a TransMail to a group of users, and most reply to it, forward it or copy it to custom folders, it is more likely to be relevant than if they all delete it immediately.... If the vast majority of the users in a given department read a piece of content sent globally, then the content is likely to be relevant to another user in that department.” EX2004, at 15-16. • “Actions – users’ actions determine both relevance and importance values. Both direct user’s actions and <u>collaborative actions (actions of other users on the same content) are taken into account</u>.” EX2006, at 58 (emphasis added). • “For example, <u>one HR employee</u> is generally likely to have <u>similar importance to another one</u>, especially <u>if they are of similar position</u> in a tree structure – e.g. they both work in employee appraisal form processing. There are clearly exceptions to this trend, but in most organizations it is <u>likely to have a positive affect on the initial states of importance</u>.” EX2006, at 22. • “Note that if required, branched structures – such as knowledge taxonomies for contexts, directories for users and Jobcode hierarchies – can be used as a correlative basis for importance on an ongoing basis. Thus for example, an importance change for one user would have <u>a cascading ‘ripple effect’ for similar users</u>.” EX2006, at 22 (emphasis added).

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
a relevance analysis module configured to determine the relevance score of the piece of electronic content sent from the sender to the user, the relevance score being determined based at least in part on the first determined measure of relevance and on the second determined measure of relevance.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a relevance analysis module configured to determine the relevance score of the piece of electronic content sent from the sender to the user, the relevance score being determined based at least in part on the first determined measure of relevance and on the second determined measure of relevance. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes determining a relevance score of the piece of electronic content sent from the sender to the user based at least in part on the first determined measure of relevance and on the second determined measure of relevance: • “Users’ actions encompass <u>a given user’s own actions</u> (a single user) <u>and other users’ actions</u> (collaborative users in the system). <u>These actions help to determine relevance</u>, as relevance is calculated based on the way users interact with content.” EX2006, at 15. • “BlueSpace uses a <u>multi-dimensional relevance system</u>, that rates the importance of each piece of content” EX2004, at 4. • “Each piece of content (submessage) can be presented to the user along with a slider that indicates its current <u>relevance score</u>.” EX2004, at 17 • “Relevance Settings” used to determine the relevance score can include “<u>My actions</u>” (“the first determined measure of relevance”) and “<u>Other peoples actions</u>” (the “second determined measure of relevance”). EX2004, at 25. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes algorithms. EX2004, at 28-32 (“8. Algorithms.”); EX2006, at 52-56 (“9. Algorithms.”). A skilled artisan would understand that these algorithms are implemented using software – i.e., “computer program modules” stored on “a computer-readable storage medium” and “configured to execute on the computer processor.” A skilled artisan would understand that a “relevance analysis module” is software.

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
2. The system of claim 1, further comprising: a content presentation module configured to present the piece of electronic content to the user in accordance with the determined relevance score and to present to the user a value describing the determined relevance score.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the system of claim 1, further comprising: a content presentation module configured to present the piece of electronic content to the user in accordance with the determined relevance score and to present to the user a value describing the determined relevance score. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that “[e]ach piece of content (submessage) can be presented to the user along with a slider that indicates its current relevance score.” EX2004, at 17. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes algorithms. <i>E.g.</i>, EX2004, at 28-32 (“8. Algorithms.”); EX2006, at 52-56 (“9. Algorithms.”). A skilled artisan would understand that these algorithms are implemented using software – i.e., “computer program modules” stored on “a computer-readable storage medium” and “configured to execute on the computer processor.” A skilled artisan would understand that a “content presentation module” is software.
3. The system of claim 1, further comprising: a search module configured to search the electronic content in accordance with the determined relevance score.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the system of claim 1, further comprising: a search module configured to search the electronic content in accordance with the determined relevance score. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that “[t]he innovation described in this white paper involves adding advanced analytics into a search system in BlueSpace, causing a dramatic improvement in relevance for the end user attempting to find content.” EX2004, at 5. “The application also ranks search results according to a relevance algorithm, rather than affording each result equal weighting.” EX2004, at 17. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes algorithms. <i>E.g.</i>, EX2004, at 28-32 (“8. Algorithms.”); EX2006, at 52-56 (“9. Algorithms.”). A skilled artisan would understand that these algorithms are implemented using software – i.e., “computer program modules” stored on “a computer-readable storage medium” and “configured to execute on the computer processor.” A skilled artisan would understand that a “search module” is software.

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
4. The system of claim 1, wherein the piece of electronic content comprises an electronic mail object in a relational mail system.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the system of claim 1, wherein the piece of electronic content comprises an electronic mail object in a relational mail system. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes “BlueSpace Relational Architecture”: BlueSpace has developed a messaging platform that is very different from existing messaging and mail systems. As introduced in Section Error! Reference source not found., email photocopies content with each generation of reply and forward, as shown in Error! Reference source not found..” EX2004, at 6.
5. The system of claim 1, wherein the electronic content comprises at least one of an email, a document, an instant message, and an SMS message.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes “BlueSpace Relational Architecture”: BlueSpace has developed a messaging platform that is very different from existing messaging and mail systems. As introduced in Section Error! Reference source not found., email photocopies content with each generation of reply and forward, as shown in Error! Reference source not found..” EX2004, at 6.

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
6. A computer program product for determining a relevance score of a piece of electronic content sent from a sender to a user,	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a computer program product for determining a relevance score of a piece of electronic content sent from a sender to a user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes a “computer-implemented system”: “SMTP treats each email as a string of text similar to a postcard or telegram that must be passed <u>between computers</u> until it reaches its desired recipients.” EX2004, at 5 (emphasis added). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes “a piece of electronic content sent from a sender to a user.” EX2004, at 14 (referring to “both <u>sent</u> and <u>received</u>” “content” (emphasis added)); <i>id.</i> at 21 (referring to “the <u>sender</u> and each <u>recipient</u> of the TransMail” (emphasis added)). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes determining a “relevance score of a piece of electronic content”: • “BlueSpace uses a multi-dimensional <u>relevance</u> system, that <u>rates</u> the <u>importance</u> of each <u>piece of content</u>” EX2004, at 4. • “<u>Each piece of content</u> (submessage) can be presented to the user along with a slider that indicates its current <u>relevance score</u>.” EX2004, at 17 (emphasis added).
the relevance score determined with respect to the user,	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the relevance score determined with respect to the user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that the relevance score is determined with respect to the user: • “[<u>T</u>he end user [is] able to affect <u>relevance</u> directly <u>for their own inbox</u>.” EX2004, at 17 (emphasis added). • “Importance ... is stored <u>with respect to each user</u>.” <i>Id.</i> (emphasis added).

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
the computer-program product having a computer-readable storage medium having computer program instructions encoded thereon comprising:	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the computer-program product having a computer-readable storage medium having computer program instructions encoded thereon. The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the computer-implemented system comprising a computer-readable storage medium storing computer program modules configured to execute on the computer processor. The computer-implemented systems described in the documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, include a computer-readable storage medium storing computer program modules configured to execute on the computer processor. For example, both the BlueSpace TransMail system and applying a relevance system to blogs are computer-implemented systems that include a computer-readable storage medium storing computer program modules configured to execute on the computer processor. <i>See generally</i> EX2004 (describing the BlueSpace TransMail system); <i>see also</i> EX2006, at 51 (describing applying the relevance system to the environment of blogs that are delivered like newsletters to subscribers); EX2004, at 6 (discussing running “the BlueSpace TransMail application”). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes algorithms. <i>E.g.</i>, EX2004, at 28-32 (“8. Algorithms.”); EX2006, at 52-56 (“9. Algorithms.”). A skilled artisan would understand that these algorithms are implemented using software – i.e., “computer program modules” stored on “a computer-readable storage medium” and “configured to execute on the computer processor.” A skilled artisan would understand that “computer program modules” is software.

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
a monitoring module configured to track actions by a plurality of users associated with an application for managing electronic content;	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a monitoring module configured to track actions by a plurality of users associated with an application for managing electronic content. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes tracking actions by a plurality of users associated with an application for managing electronic content: • “The granularity of this architecture allows the application to <u>record all actions by users</u> in the system, ensuring that the application has audited the entire lifecycle of the content.” EX2004, at 18 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace is able to <u>track what happens to content</u> during its lifecycle.” EX2004, at 6 (emphasis added). • “Mail actions inputs – the <u>user actions recorded</u> by the system.” EX2004, at 13 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace <u>audits</u> all significant <u>user actions</u> inside a BlueSpace system.” EX2004, at 14 (emphasis added). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes algorithms. EX2004, at 28-32 (“8. Algorithms.”); EX2006, at 52-56 (“9. Algorithms.”). A skilled artisan would understand that these algorithms are implemented using software – i.e., “computer program modules” stored on “a computer-readable storage medium” and “configured to execute on the computer processor.” A skilled artisan would understand that a “monitoring module” is software.

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
a first relevance measurement module coupled to the monitoring module and configured to determine a first measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content based at least in part on one or more actions of the user on the piece of electronic content;	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a first relevance measurement module coupled to the monitoring module and configured to determine a first measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content based at least in part on one or more actions of the user on the piece of electronic content. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes monitoring actions of the user on the piece of electronic content (and using those actions as an input to a relevance algorithm to rate the importance of the content): • “BlueSpace uses a multi-dimensional relevance system, that rates the importance of each piece of content <u>based on</u> the following criteria: 1. <u>User actions – what did the user do with the mail?</u> If they moved it to a folder or forwarded it then it is likely to be if significant importance.” EX2004, at 4 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace can take <u>direct user input</u> to help determine relevance.” EX2004, at 17 (emphasis added). • “Mail actions relevance relies on the <u>user’s actions</u> to help determine content’s relevance for content in all the user’s mail folders – both sent and received.” EX2004, at 14 (emphasis added). • “a <u>user’s own actions</u> can be used as an input to a relevance algorithm.” EX2004, at 14 & EX2006, at 18 (emphasis added). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes algorithms for determining a measure of relevance based on the user’s actions: “a user’s own actions can be used as an input to a relevance algorithm.” EX2004, at 14; EX2006, at 18; see also EX2004, at 28-32 (“8. Algorithms.”); EX2006, at 52-56 (“9. Algorithms.”). A skilled artisan would understand that these algorithms are implemented using software – i.e., “computer program modules” stored on “a computer-readable storage medium” and “configured to execute on the computer processor.” A skilled artisan would understand that a “first relevance measurement module” is software. A skilled artisan would understand from the documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, that a first relevance measurement module is coupled to the monitoring module because the documentation describes that data captured through the software/algorithms for monitoring user actions is provided to relevance algorithms: “Each piece of content is audited and managed through its lifecycle in the mail system, and every significant user action is audited. This provides a powerful set of raw data that can be used in relevance algorithms.” EX2004, at 4; EX2006, at 5.

a second relevance measurement module coupled to the monitoring module and configured to: identify at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user, and	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second relevance measurement module coupled to the monitoring module and configured to: identify at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user, and determine a second measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content based at least in part on one or more measures derived from the group described below. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes identifying at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user: • “Mail actions collaborative relevance relies on <u>the actions of other users</u> to determine the relevance of content in a given user’s folders – both sent and <u>received</u>.” EX2004, at 15 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace uses a multi-dimensional relevance system, that rates the importance of <u>each piece of content</u> based on the following criteria: ...2. User collaborative actions – <u>what did other users do with the mail?</u> Again, their actions indicate their views on the content’s importance.” EX2004, at 4 (emphasis added). • “Mail actions collaborative relevance – scenarios involving other users’ actions to determine content relevance.” EX2004, at 13. • “In the following scenarios, <u>other users’ actions</u> can be used to help <u>determine</u> the <u>relevance of content to a given user</u>: ... If a user sends a TransMail to a group of users, and most reply to it, forward it or copy it to custom folders, it is more likely to be relevant than if they all delete it immediately.... If the vast majority of the users in a given department read a piece of content sent globally, then the content is likely to be relevant to another user in that department.” EX2004, at 15-16. • “Actions – users’ actions determine both relevance and importance values. Both direct user’s actions and <u>collaborative actions (actions of other users on the same content) are taken into account</u>.” EX2006, at 58 (emphasis added). • “For example, one HR employee is generally likely to have similar importance to another one, especially if they are of similar position in a tree structure – e.g. they both work in employee appraisal form processing. There are clearly exceptions to this trend, but in most organizations it is likely to have a positive affect on the initial states of importance.” EX2006, at 22. • “Note that if required, branched structures – such as knowledge taxonomies for contexts, directories for users and Jobcode hierarchies – can be used as a correlative basis for importance on an ongoing basis. Thus for example, an importance change for one user would have <u>a cascading ‘ripple effect’ for similar users</u>.” EX2006, at 22 (emphasis added). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes algorithms for determining a measure of relevance. EX2004, at 28-32 (“8. Algorithms.”); EX2006, at 52-56 (“9. Algorithms.”). A skilled artisan would understand that these algorithms are implemented using software – i.e., “computer program modules” stored on “a
--	--

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
	computer-readable storage medium” and “configured to execute on the computer processor.” A skilled artisan would understand that “a second relevance measurement module” is software. A skilled artisan would understand from the documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, that a second relevance measurement module coupled to the monitoring module because the documentation describes that data captured through the software/algorithms for monitoring user actions is provided to relevance algorithms: “Each piece of content is audited and managed through its lifecycle in the mail system, and every significant user action is audited. This provides a powerful set of raw data that can be used in relevance algorithms.” EX2004, at 4; EX2006, at 5.
determine a second measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content based at least in part on one or more measures derived from the group consisting of:	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second relevance measurement module coupled to the monitoring module and configured to determine a second measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content as based at least in part on one or more measures derived from the group below. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes measures of relevance based on the measures derived from the group below, as set forth below:
a local importance describing an importance of the sender to the user,	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second measure of relevance based on measures that include a local importance describing an importance of the sender to the user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that a measure of relevance can be the importance of the sender to the user: • “Allow <u>user to rate senders</u> with a relevance score.” EX2004, at 27 (emphasis added). • “A user can interact with the relevance results by changing a ‘slider’ (graphical element) on a ... per sender basis, to help the system learn.” EX2004, at 4. • “Consider the following user action scenarios, in which a <u>user’s own actions</u> can be used as an input to a relevance algorithm: ... - If a user always deletes content <u>from a specific user</u> quickly, then it is <u>unlikely</u> that any <u>content from this user is of significant relevance to them</u>. - If a user always reads content from <u>another specific user</u> before reading content from other users in any given new set of new mail received into their inbox, then it is likely that <u>content from this specific user is of significant relevance</u>.” EX2004, at 14 (emphasis added).

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
a global importance describing an importance of the sender within an organization with which the plurality of users are associated,	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second measure of relevance based on measures that include a global importance describing an importance of the sender within an organization with which the plurality of users are associated. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that a measure of relevance can be the importance of the sender within an organization with which the plurality of users are associated: • “[R]elevance is not a purely user-centric phenomenon – a separate question relates to <u>relevance for the entire enterprise</u>.” EX2004, at 17 (emphasis added). • “In the following scenarios, <u>other users’ actions</u> can be used to help <u>determine the relevance</u> of content to a given user: ... If <u>most users read content from a particular author (e.g. the CEO), then content from this author is typically of greater relevance</u> than content from a different author that no-one ever reads.” EX2004, at 15-16 (emphasis added).
a content relevance determined responsive to content of the piece of electronic content, and	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second measure of relevance based on measures that include a content relevance determined responsive to content of the piece of electronic content. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that a measure of relevance can be the content of the piece of electronic content: • “In the following scenarios, other users’ actions can be used <u>to help determine the relevance</u> of content to a given user: ... If the majority of other users tend to read <u>content linked to a particular context</u>, then <u>content</u> attached to that context is <u>more likely to be relevant</u> to the user in question.” EX2004, at 16 (emphasis added).

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
one or more actions on the piece of electronic content of the at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user; and	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second measure of relevance based on measures that include one or more actions on the piece of electronic content of the at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that a measure of relevance can be actions on the piece of electronic content of the at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user”: • “Mail actions collaborative relevance relies on <u>the actions of other users</u> to determine the relevance of content in a given user’s folders – both sent and <u>received</u>.” EX2004, at 15 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace uses a multi-dimensional relevance system, that rates the importance of <u>each piece of content</u> based on the following criteria: ...2. User collaborative actions – <u>what did other users do with the mail?</u> Again, their actions indicate their views on the content’s importance.” EX2004, at 4 (emphasis added). • “Mail actions <u>collaborative relevance</u> – scenarios involving <u>other users’ actions</u> to determine content relevance.” EX2004, at 13. • “In the following scenarios, <u>other users’ actions</u> can be used to help <u>determine</u> the <u>relevance of content to a given user</u>: ... If a user sends a TransMail to a group of users, and most reply to it, forward it or copy it to custom folders, it is more likely to be relevant than if they all delete it immediately.... If the vast majority of the users in a given department read a piece of content sent globally, then the content is likely to be relevant to another user in that department.” EX2004, at 15-16. • “Actions – users’ actions determine both relevance and importance values. Both direct user’s actions and <u>collaborative actions (actions of other users on the same content) are taken into account</u>.” EX2006, at 58 (emphasis added). • “For example, <u>one HR employee</u> is generally likely to have <u>similar importance to another one</u>, especially <u>if they are of similar position</u> in a tree structure – e.g. they both work in employee appraisal form processing. There are clearly exceptions to this trend, but in most organizations it is <u>likely to have a positive affect on the initial states of importance</u>.” EX2006, at 22. • “Note that if required, branched structures – such as knowledge taxonomies for contexts, directories for users and Jobcode hierarchies – can be used as a correlative basis for importance on an ongoing basis. Thus for example, an importance change for one user would have <u>a cascading ‘ripple effect’ for similar users</u>.” EX2006, at 22 (emphasis added).

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
a relevance analysis module configured to determine the relevance score of the piece of electronic content sent from the sender to the user, the relevance score being determined based at least in part on the first determined measure of relevance and on the second determined measure of relevance.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a relevance analysis module configured to determine the relevance score of the piece of electronic content sent from the sender to the user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes determining a relevance score of the piece of electronic content sent from the sender to the user based at least in part on the first determined measure of relevance and on the second determined measure of relevance: • “Users’ actions encompass <u>a given user’s own actions</u> (a single user) <u>and other users’ actions</u> (collaborative users in the system). <u>These actions help to determine relevance</u>, as relevance is calculated based on the way users interact with content.” EX2006, at 15. • “BlueSpace uses a <u>multi-dimensional relevance system</u>, that rates the importance of each piece of content” EX2004, at 4. • “Each piece of content (submessage) can be presented to the user along with a slider that indicates its current <u>relevance score</u>.” EX2004, at 17 • “Relevance Settings” used to determine the relevance score can include “<u>My actions</u>” (“the first determined measure of relevance”) and “<u>Other peoples actions</u>” (the “second determined measure of relevance”). EX2004, at 25. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes algorithms. EX2004, at 28-32 (“8. Algorithms.”); EX2006, at 52-56 (“9. Algorithms.”). A skilled artisan would understand that these algorithms are implemented using software – i.e., “computer program modules” stored on “a computer-readable storage medium” and “configured to execute on the computer processor.” A skilled artisan would understand that a “relevance analysis module” is software.

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
7. A computer-implemented method for determining a relevance score of a piece of electronic content sent from a sender to a user,	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a computer-implemented method for determining a relevance score of a piece of electronic content sent from a sender to a user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes a “computer-implemented system”: “SMTP treats each email as a string of text similar to a postcard or telegram that must be passed <u>between computers</u> until it reaches its desired recipients.” EX2004, at 5 (emphasis added). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes “a piece of electronic content sent from a sender to a user.” EX2004, at 14 (referring to “both <u>sent</u> and <u>received</u>” “content” (emphasis added)); <i>id.</i> at 21 (referring to “the <u>sender</u> and each <u>recipient</u> of the TransMail” (emphasis added)). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes determining a “relevance score of a piece of electronic content”: • “BlueSpace uses a multi-dimensional <u>relevance</u> system, that <u>rates</u> the <u>importance</u> of each <u>piece of content</u>” EX2004, at 4. • “<u>Each piece of content</u> (submessage) can be presented to the user along with a slider that indicates its current <u>relevance score</u>.” EX2004, at 17 (emphasis added).
the relevance score determined with respect to the user,	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the relevance score determined with respect to the user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that the relevance score is determined with respect to the user: • “[<u>T</u>he end user [is] able to affect <u>relevance</u> directly <u>for their own inbox</u>.” EX2004, at 17 (emphasis added). • “Importance ... is stored <u>with respect to each user</u>.” <i>Id.</i> (emphasis added).

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
the computer-implemented method comprising: tracking actions by a plurality of users associated with an application for managing electronic content;	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the computer-implemented method comprising: tracking actions by a plurality of users associated with an application for managing electronic content. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes tracking actions by a plurality of users associated with an application for managing electronic content: • “The granularity of this architecture allows the application to <u>record all actions by users</u> in the system, ensuring that the application has audited the entire lifecycle of the content.” EX2004, at 18 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace is able to <u>track what happens to content</u> during its lifecycle.” EX2004, at 6 (emphasis added). • “Mail actions inputs – the <u>user actions recorded</u> by the system.” EX2004, at 13 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace <u>audits</u> all significant <u>user actions</u> inside a BlueSpace system.” EX2004, at 14 (emphasis added).

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
identifying at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user,	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of identifying at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes identifying at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user: • “Mail actions collaborative relevance relies on <u>the actions of other users</u> to determine the relevance of content in a given user’s folders – both sent and <u>received</u>.” EX2004, at 15 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace uses a multi-dimensional relevance system, that rates the importance of <u>each piece of content</u> based on the following criteria: ...2. User collaborative actions – <u>what did other users do with the mail?</u> Again, their actions indicate their views on the content’s importance.” EX2004, at 4 (emphasis added). • “Mail actions collaborative relevance – scenarios involving other users’ actions to determine content relevance.” EX2004, at 13. • “In the following scenarios, <u>other users’ actions</u> can be used to help <u>determine</u> the <u>relevance of content to a given user</u>: ... If a user sends a TransMail to a group of users, and most reply to it, forward it or copy it to custom folders, it is more likely to be relevant than if they all delete it immediately.... If the vast majority of the users in a given department read a piece of content sent globally, then the content is likely to be relevant to another user in that department.” EX2004, at 15-16. • “Actions – users’ actions determine both relevance and importance values. Both direct user’s actions and <u>collaborative actions (actions of other users on the same content) are taken into account</u>.” EX2006, at 58 (emphasis added). • “For example, one HR employee is generally likely to have similar importance to another one, especially if they are of similar position in a tree structure – e.g. they both work in employee appraisal form processing. There are clearly exceptions to this trend, but in most organizations it is likely to have a positive affect on the initial states of importance.” EX2006, at 22. • “Note that if required, branched structures – such as knowledge taxonomies for contexts, directories for users and Jobcode hierarchies – can be used as a correlative basis for importance on an ongoing basis. Thus for example, an importance change for one user would have <u>a cascading ‘ripple effect’ for similar users</u>.” EX2006, at 22 (emphasis added).

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
determining a first measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content based at least in part on one or more actions of the user on the piece of electronic content;	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of determining a first measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content based at least in part on one or more actions of the user on the piece of electronic content. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes monitoring actions of the user on the piece of electronic content (and using those actions as an input to a relevance algorithm to rate the importance of the content): • “BlueSpace uses a multi-dimensional relevance system, that rates the importance of each piece of content <u>based on</u> the following criteria: 1. <u>User actions – what did the user do with the mail?</u> If they moved it to a folder or forwarded it then it is likely to be if significant importance.” EX2004, at 4 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace can take <u>direct user input</u> to help determine relevance.” EX2004, at 17 (emphasis added). • “Mail actions relevance relies on the <u>user’s actions</u> to help determine content’s relevance for content in all the user’s mail folders – both sent and received.” EX2004, at 14 (emphasis added). • “a <u>user’s own actions</u> can be used as an input to a relevance algorithm.” EX2004, at 14 & EX2006, at 18 (emphasis added).
determining a second measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content based at least in part on one or more measures derived from the group consisting of:	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of determining a second measure of relevance of the piece of electronic content based at least in part on one or more measures derived from the group described below. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes measures of relevance based on the measures derived from the group below, as set forth below:

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
a local importance describing an importance of the sender to the user,	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second measure of relevance based on measures that include a local importance describing an importance of the sender to the user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that a measure of relevance can be the importance of the sender to the user: • “Allow user to rate senders with a relevance score.” EX2004, at 27 (emphasis added). • “A user can interact with the relevance results by changing a ‘slider’ (graphical element) on a ... per sender basis, to help the system learn.” EX2004, at 4. • “Consider the following user action scenarios, in which a user’s own actions can be used as an input to a relevance algorithm: ... - If a user always deletes content from a specific user quickly, then it is unlikely that any content from this user is of significant relevance to them. - If a user always reads content from another specific user before reading content from other users in any given new set of new mail received into their inbox, then it is likely that content from this specific user is of significant relevance.” EX2004, at 14 (emphasis added).
a global importance describing an importance of the sender within an organization with which the plurality of users are associated,	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second measure of relevance based on measures that include a global importance describing an importance of the sender within an organization with which the plurality of users are associated. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that a measure of relevance can be the importance of the sender within an organization with which the plurality of users are associated: • “[R]elevance is not a purely user-centric phenomenon – a separate question relates to relevance for the entire enterprise.” EX2004, at 17 (emphasis added). • “In the following scenarios, other users’ actions can be used to help determine the relevance of content to a given user: ... If most users read content from a particular author (e.g. the CEO), then content from this author is typically of greater relevance than content from a different author that no-one ever reads.” EX2004, at 15-16 (emphasis added).

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
a content relevance determined responsive to content of the piece of electronic content, and	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second measure of relevance based on measures that include a content relevance determined responsive to content of the piece of electronic content. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that a measure of relevance can be the content of the piece of electronic content: • “In the following scenarios, other users’ actions can be used to help determine the relevance of content to a given user: ... If the majority of other users tend to read <u>content linked to a particular context</u>, then <u>content</u> attached to that context is <u>more likely to be relevant</u> to the user in question.” EX2004, at 16 (emphasis added).

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
one or more actions on the piece of electronic content of the at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user; and	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of a second measure of relevance based on measures that include one or more actions on the piece of electronic content of the at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that a measure of relevance can be actions on the piece of electronic content of the at least one other of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the piece of electronic content and that is cognate to the user”: • “Mail actions collaborative relevance relies on <u>the actions of other users</u> to determine the relevance of content in a given user’s folders – both sent and <u>received</u>.” EX2004, at 15 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace uses a multi-dimensional relevance system, that rates the importance of <u>each piece of content</u> based on the following criteria: ...2. User collaborative actions – <u>what did other users do with the mail?</u> Again, their actions indicate their views on the content’s importance.” EX2004, at 4 (emphasis added). • “Mail actions <u>collaborative relevance</u> – scenarios involving <u>other users’ actions</u> to determine content relevance.” EX2004, at 13. • “In the following scenarios, <u>other users’ actions</u> can be used to help <u>determine</u> the <u>relevance of content to a given user</u>: ... If a user sends a TransMail to a group of users, and most reply to it, forward it or copy it to custom folders, it is more likely to be relevant than if they all delete it immediately.... If the vast majority of the users in a given department read a piece of content sent globally, then the content is likely to be relevant to another user in that department.” EX2004, at 15-16. • “Actions – users’ actions determine both relevance and importance values. Both direct user’s actions and <u>collaborative actions (actions of other users on the same content) are taken into account</u>.” EX2006, at 58 (emphasis added). • “For example, <u>one HR employee</u> is generally likely to have <u>similar importance to another one</u>, especially <u>if they are of similar position</u> in a tree structure – e.g. they both work in employee appraisal form processing. There are clearly exceptions to this trend, but in most organizations it is <u>likely to have a positive affect on the initial states of importance</u>.” EX2006, at 22. • “Note that if required, branched structures – such as knowledge taxonomies for contexts, directories for users and Jobcode hierarchies – can be used as a correlative basis for importance on an ongoing basis. Thus for example, an importance change for one user would have <u>a cascading ‘ripple effect’ for similar users</u>.” EX2006, at 22 (emphasis added).

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
determining the relevance score of the piece of electronic content sent from the sender to the user, the relevance score being determined based at least in part on the first determined measure of relevance and on the second determined measure of relevance.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of determining the relevance score of the piece of electronic content sent from the sender to the user, the relevance score being determined based at least in part on the first determined measure of relevance and on the second determined measure of relevance. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes determining a relevance score of the piece of electronic content sent from the sender to the user based at least in part on the first determined measure of relevance and on the second determined measure of relevance: • “Users’ actions encompass <u>a given user’s own actions</u> (a single user) <u>and other users’ actions</u> (collaborative users in the system). <u>These actions help to determine relevance</u>, as relevance is calculated based on the way users interact with content.” EX2006, at 15. • “BlueSpace uses a <u>multi-dimensional relevance system</u>, that rates the importance of each piece of content” EX2004, at 4. • “Each piece of content (submessage) can be presented to the user along with a slider that indicates its current <u>relevance score</u>.” EX2004, at 17 • “Relevance Settings” used to determine the relevance score can include “<u>My actions</u>” (“the first determined measure of relevance”) and “<u>Other peoples actions</u>” (the “second determined measure of relevance”). EX2004, at 25.

8. The system of claim 1, wherein identifying at least one other of the plurality of users that is cognate to the user comprises analyzing historical actions of the at least one other of the plurality of users with respect to historical actions of the user.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the system of claim 1, wherein identifying at least one other of the plurality of users that is cognate to the user comprises analyzing historical actions of the at least one other of the plurality of users with respect to historical actions of the user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that identifying at least one other of the plurality of users that is cognate to the user can include analyzing historical actions of the at least one other of the plurality of users with respect to historical actions of the user. • “An ‘importance’ factor is determined for each entity (users, groups, Jobcodes etc) in the system, acting to weight various inputs to the relevance algorithms. Importance is based on <u>historical learning</u> in the system, based on <u>previous actions by users</u>.” EX2004, at 11. • “For example, one HR employee is generally likely to have <u>similar importance to another one</u>, especially if they are of similar position in a tree structure – e.g. they both work in employee appraisal form processing. There are clearly exceptions to this trend, but in most organizations it is likely to have a positive affect on the initial states of importance.” EX2006, at 22. • “Mail actions collaborative relevance relies on <u>the actions of other users</u> to determine the relevance of content in a given user’s folders – both sent and <u>received</u>.” EX2004, at 15 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace uses a multi-dimensional relevance system, that rates the importance of <u>each piece of content</u> based on the following criteria: ...2. <u>User collaborative actions – what did other users do with the mail?</u> Again, their actions indicate their views on the content’s importance.” EX2004, at 4 (emphasis added). • “Mail actions collaborative relevance – scenarios involving other users’ actions to determine content relevance.” EX2004, at 13. • “In the following scenarios, <u>other users’ actions</u> can be used to help <u>determine</u> the <u>relevance of content to a given user</u>: ... If a user sends a TransMail to a group of users, and most reply to it, forward it or copy it to custom folders, it is more likely to be relevant than if they all delete it immediately.... If the vast majority of the users in a given department read a piece of content sent globally, then the content is likely to be relevant to another user in that department.” EX2004, at 15-16. • “<u>Actions</u> – users’ actions determine both relevance and importance values. Both <u>direct user’s actions</u> and <u>collaborative actions (actions of other users on the same content)</u> are taken into account.” EX2006, at 58 (emphasis added). • “Note that if required, branched structures – such as knowledge taxonomies for contexts, directories for users and Jobcode hierarchies – can be used as a correlative basis for importance on an ongoing basis. Thus for example, an importance change for one user would have <u>a cascading ‘ripple effect’ for similar users</u>.” EX2006, at 22 (emphasis added).
--	--

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
9. The system of claim 8, wherein the at least one other of the plurality of users is cognate to the user, and the user is not cognate to the at least one other of the plurality of users.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the system of claim 8, wherein the at least one other of the plurality of users is cognate to the user, and the user is not cognate to the at least one other of the plurality of users. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that, in the system of claim 8, it is possible for at least one other of the plurality of users (e.g., a second users) to be cognate to the first user, but the first user is not cognate to the, e.g., second user. For example, the documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that “one HR employee is generally likely to have similar importance to another one, especially if they are of similar position in a tree structure – e.g. they both work in employee appraisal form processing.” EX2006, at 22. The documentation also discusses that “[a]n ‘importance’ factor is determined for each entity (users, groups, Jobcodes etc) in the system, acting to weight various inputs to the relevance algorithms,” and “[i]mportance is based on <u>historical learning</u> in the system, based on <u>previous actions by users</u>.” EX2004, at 11. Given these disclosures, the two HR employees (User A and User B) who both work in employee appraisal form processing could initially be cognate to each other based upon their similar role and/or their shared similar previous actions. However, the documentation also discloses that “direct user input” can help determine relevance, including, for example, that a user can provide input that certain other users are not relevant. EX2004, at 17 (“For example, a user might make their boss ‘very relevant’ but their junior, chatty sales clerk ‘rarely relevant’ – these weightings can then be added into the relevance algorithm.”); EX2004, at 20 (“The user can, if they wish, change these sliders to help the system learn.”); EX 2004, at 24 (“Using preferences the user can affect the different inputs into the relevance algorithm. This allows the user to tune the relevance algorithm to provide the content they are interested in. They can affect the relative strength of the different actions by users, as well as affecting the relative strength of the different entities with importance (Jobcodes, users etc).”). Therefore, HR employee User A could provide direct input that HR employee User B is “not relevant” to User A. In this scenario, User A could still be cognate to User B, but User B would no longer be cognate to User A.
10. The system of claim 4, wherein the electronic mail object includes one or more submessages.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the system of claim 4, wherein the electronic mail object includes one or more submessages. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that “[t]here are three types of <u>submessage</u> with respect to any given TransMail....” EX2004, at 7 (emphasis added).

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
11. The system of claim 10, wherein the submessages are represented in the electronic mail object as references to submessage content stored in a data store of the relational mail system.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the system of claim 10, wherein the submessages are represented in the electronic mail object as references to submessage content stored in a data store of the relational mail system. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes “BlueSpace Relational Architecture”: BlueSpace has developed a messaging platform that is very different from existing messaging and mail systems. As introduced in Section Error! Reference source not found., email photocopies content with each generation of reply and forward, as shown in Error! Reference source not found.” EX2004, at 6 (emphasis added). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that “[t]here are three types of submessage with respect to any given TransMail...” EX2004, at 7 (emphasis added).
12. The system of claim 4, wherein the electronic mail object has an associated job code representing a business process with which the electronic mail object is associated.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the system of claim 4, wherein the electronic mail object has an associated job code representing a business process with which the electronic mail object is associated The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes “Jobcodes – a mechanism for linking an entire submessage (as defined in Section Error! Reference source not found.) to a specific business process.” EX2004, at 12.
13. The computer program product of claim 6, further comprising: a content presentation module configured to present the piece of electronic content to the user in accordance with the determined relevance score and to present to the user a value describing the determined relevance score.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the computer program product of claim 6, further comprising: a content presentation module configured to present the piece of electronic content to the user in accordance with the determined relevance score and to present to the user a value describing the determined relevance score. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that “[e]ach piece of content (submessage) can be presented to the user along with a slider that indicates its current relevance score.” EX2004, at 17. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes algorithms. <i>E.g.</i>, EX2004, at 28-32 (“8. Algorithms.”); EX2006, at 52-56 (“9. Algorithms.”). A skilled artisan would understand that these algorithms are implemented using software – i.e., “computer program modules” stored on “a computer-readable storage medium” and “configured to execute on the computer processor.” A skilled artisan would understand that a “content presentation module” is software.

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
14. The computer program product of claim 6, further comprising: a search module configured to search the electronic content in accordance with the determined relevance score.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the computer program product of claim 6, further comprising: a search module configured to search the electronic content in accordance with the determined relevance score. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes “[t]he innovation described in this white paper involves adding advanced analytics into a <u>search</u> system in BlueSpace, causing a dramatic improvement in relevance for the end user attempting to find content.” EX2004, at 5. “The application also <u>ranks search</u> results according to a <u>relevance</u> algorithm, rather than affording each result equal weighting.” EX2004, at 17. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes algorithms. <i>E.g.</i>, EX2004, at 28-32 (“8. Algorithms.”); EX2006, at 52-56 (“9. Algorithms.”). A skilled artisan would understand that these algorithms are implemented using software – i.e., “computer program modules” stored on “a computer-readable storage medium” and “configured to execute on the computer processor.” A skilled artisan would understand that a “search module” is software.
15. The computer program product of claim 6, wherein the electronic content comprises at least one of an email, a document, an instant message, and an SMS message.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the computer program product of claim 6, wherein the electronic content comprises at least one of an email, a document, an instant message, and an SMS message The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes describes “BlueSpace Relational Architecture”: BlueSpace has developed a messaging platform that is very different from existing messaging and mail systems. As introduced in Section Error! Reference source not found., <u>email</u> photocopies content with each generation of reply and forward, as shown in Error! Reference source not found.” EX2004, at 6 (emphasis added).
16. The computer program product of claim 6, wherein the piece of electronic content comprises an electronic mail object in a relational mail system.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the computer program product of claim 6, wherein the piece of electronic content comprises an electronic mail object in a relational mail system. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes “BlueSpace <u>Relational</u> Architecture”: BlueSpace has developed a messaging platform that is very different from existing messaging and mail systems. As introduced in Section Error! Reference source not found., <u>email</u> photocopies content with each generation of reply and forward, as shown in Error! Reference source not found.” EX2004, at 6.

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
17. The computer program product of claim 16, wherein the electronic mail object includes one or more submessages that are represented in the electronic mail object as references to submessage content stored in a data store of the relational mail system.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the computer program product of claim 16, wherein the electronic mail object includes one or more submessages that are represented in the electronic mail object as references to submessage content stored in a data store of the relational mail system. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes “BlueSpace <u>Relational</u> Architecture”: BlueSpace has developed a messaging platform that is very different from existing messaging and mail systems. As introduced in Section Error! Reference source not found., <u>email</u> photocopies content with each generation of reply and forward, as shown in Error! Reference source not found.” EX2004, at 6 (emphasis added). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that “[t]here are three types of <u>submessage</u> with respect to any given TransMail....” EX2004, at 7 (emphasis added).
18. The method of claim 7, further comprising: presenting the piece of electronic content to the user in accordance with the determined relevance score and presenting to the user a value describing the determined relevance score.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the method of claim 7, further comprising: presenting the piece of electronic content to the user in accordance with the determined relevance score and presenting to the user a value describing the determined relevance score. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes “[e]ach piece of content (submessage) can be <u>presented to the user</u> along with a slider that indicates its <u>current relevance score</u>.” EX2004, at 17.
19. The method of claim 7, further comprising: searching the electronic content in accordance with the determined relevance score.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the method of claim 7, further comprising: searching the electronic content in accordance with the determined relevance score. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes “[t]he innovation described in this white paper involves adding advanced analytics into a <u>search</u> system in BlueSpace, causing a dramatic improvement in relevance for the end user attempting to find content.” EX2004, at 5. “The application also <u>ranks search</u> results according to a <u>relevance</u> algorithm, rather than affording each result equal weighting.” EX2004, at 17.

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
20. The method of claim 7, wherein the piece of electronic content comprises an electronic mail object in a relational mail system.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes “BlueSpace Relational Architecture”: BlueSpace has developed a messaging platform that is very different from existing messaging and mail systems. As introduced in Section Error! Reference source not found., email photocopies content with each generation of reply and forward, as shown in Error! Reference source not found.” EX2004, at 6.
21. The method of claim 20, wherein the electronic mail object includes one or more submessages that are represented in the electronic mail object as references to submessage content stored in a data store of the relational mail system.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the method of claim 20, wherein the electronic mail object includes one or more submessages that are represented in the electronic mail object as references to submessage content stored in a data store of the relational mail system. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes “BlueSpace Relational Architecture”: BlueSpace has developed a messaging platform that is very different from existing messaging and mail systems. As introduced in Section Error! Reference source not found., email photocopies content with each generation of reply and forward, as shown in Error! Reference source not found.” EX2004, at 6 (emphasis added). The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that “[t]here are three types of submessage with respect to any given TransMail....” EX2004, at 7 (emphasis added).

'217 Patent Claim Limitation	Conception documents
22. The method of claim 7, wherein identifying at least one other of the plurality of users that is cognate to the user comprises analyzing historical actions of the one other of the plurality of users with respect to historical actions of the user.	The BlueSpace mail documents reflect that, by at least June 7, 2005, Justin and Paul Marston had conceived of the method of claim 7, wherein identifying at least one other of the plurality of users that is cognate to the user comprises analyzing historical actions of the one other of the plurality of users with respect to historical actions of the user. The documentation between September 4, 2004, and June 7, 2005, describes that identifying at least one other of the plurality of users that is cognate to the user can include analyzing historical actions of the at least one other of the plurality of users with respect to historical actions of the user. • “An ‘importance’ factor is determined for each entity (users, groups, Jobcodes etc) in the system, acting to weight various inputs to the relevance algorithms. Importance is based on <u>historical learning</u> in the system, based on <u>previous actions by users.</u>” EX2004, at 11. • “For example, one HR employee is generally likely to have <u>similar importance to another one</u>, especially if they are of similar position in a tree structure – e.g. they both work in employee appraisal form processing. There are clearly exceptions to this trend, but in most organizations it is likely to have a positive affect on the initial states of importance.” EX2006, at 22. • “Mail actions collaborative relevance relies on <u>the actions of other users</u> to determine the relevance of content in a given user’s folders – both sent and <u>received.</u>” EX2004, at 15 (emphasis added). • “BlueSpace uses a multi-dimensional relevance system, that rates the importance of <u>each piece of content</u> based on the following criteria: ...2. <u>User collaborative actions – what did other users do with the mail?</u> Again, their actions indicate their views on the content’s importance.” EX2004, at 4 (emphasis added). • “Mail actions collaborative relevance – scenarios involving other users’ actions to determine content relevance.” EX2004, at 13. • “In the following scenarios, <u>other users’ actions</u> can be used to help <u>determine the relevance of content to a given user:</u> ... If a user sends a TransMail to a group of users, and most reply to it, forward it or copy it to custom folders, it is more likely to be relevant than if they all delete it immediately.... If the vast majority of the users in a given department read a piece of content sent globally, then the content is likely to be relevant to another user in that department.” EX2004, at 15-16. • “<u>Actions</u> – users’ actions determine both relevance and importance values. Both <u>direct user’s actions</u> and <u>collaborative actions (actions of other users on the same content) are taken into account.</u>” EX2006, at 58 (emphasis added). • “Note that if required, branched structures – such as knowledge taxonomies for contexts, directories for users and Jobcode hierarchies – can be used as a correlative basis for importance on an ongoing basis. Thus for example, an importance change for one user would have <u>a cascading ‘ripple effect’ for similar users.</u>” EX2006, at 22 (emphasis added).

