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**Proposed Response to Each Rejections/Objections**

1. 103 Rejection of claims 1-11 and 19-22 (1, 11 are independent)

Strategy: The references cited by the Examiner either alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest a second scan procedure by scanning the group of computing systems using the base installation software catalogue to identify installed software programs.

The references disclose updating the aggregate package population record. The update operations can be initiated at regular time periods to discover recently added or deleted clients. They do not disclose a second scan using the base installation software catalogue.

We intend to make the following amendments to traverse the examiner’s rejections and get the claims allowed.

Claim 1

performing a first scan procedure by scanning a single selected ~~each~~ computing system of the group using a first software signature catalogue to identify installed programs[[,]];

adding software signatures of identified installed programs to a base installation software catalogue[[,]]; and

performing a second scan procedure ~~by scanning~~ on the remaining members of the group of computing systems using the base installation software catalogue created during the first scan of the single selected computing system of the group, the first scan adding only software signatures to the base installation software catalogue if those software signatures were identified in the first software signature catalogue and present on the single selected computing system, the second scan procedure providing an increased efficiency of scanning the remaining members of the group starting with a reduced size software catalogue comprising the base installation software catalogue which includes at the beginning of the second scan, only software signatures present on the single selected computing system of the group ~~to identify installed software programs~~.

Please let us know, in case you would like to recommend another 103 strategy.

1. 112b Rejection of claim 4, Strategy:

We propose making the following amendment to claim 4 to traverse the rejection.

Claim 4

The method according to claim 2, wherein the ~~members~~ computing systems of the sub-group ~~of computing systems~~ are selected based on a directive external to the computing systems of the group.

1. 101 Rejection of claims 1-11 and 14-22, Strategy:

We propose adding “non-transitory” language to claims 14-18 and preparing an Enfish argument to traverse the rejection.

1. Other objections will be corrected as per the suggestions of the examiner.