

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 10 FEB 2005

WIPOPCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
---	--

International application No. PCT/EP2004/004731	International filing date (day/month/year) 04.05.2004	Priority date (day/month/year) 16.05.2003
--	--	--

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G06F17/30, G06F3/033

Applicant
SAP AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) 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

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

<p>Name and mailing address of the ISA:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p>European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016</p> </div>	<p>Authorized Officer</p> <p style="margin-top: 20px;">Abbing, R</p> <p>Telephone No. +31 70 340-4069</p> <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 20px;"> </div>
---	---

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - a sequence listing
 - table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - in written format
 - in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - contained in the international application as filed.
 - filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/004731

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-10
	No: Claims	11-18
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-18
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-18
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V.

- 1 The following document is referred to in this communication:
D1 : WO 02/103576 A (SIEBEL SYSTEMS, INC; SUBRAMANIAM, PAVITRA;
ZOSS, JASON; YING, JIAN-JUN) 27 December 2002 (2002-12-27)
- 2 INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1, 11, 15
- 2.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

Document D1 discloses among others a search center user interface (see pages 44 ff., "*SEARCH CENTER USER INTERFACE*"), which comprises multiples panes, presented simultaneously to facilitate searching and editing data.

The search center user interface (see e.g. figures 26 & 27) comprises a first pane displaying a general search interface (figure 26, 2610) for search among objects, for displaying the results and for receiving a selection of an object in the result set (figure 26, 2620).

This first pane corresponds exactly to the claimed first pane of the user interface as described by claim 1.

The search center user interface of D1 also comprises a second pane (figure 26, lower part of 2605) for selecting views for the data objects selected in the first pane (e.g. "*Activities*", "*Invoices*", "*Orders*" ...). These views may be associated with certain actions on the data objects (e.g. "*Activity plans*", "*Orders*") and may also be used for selecting further data objects, related to or included in the first selected data objects, which are then displayed and may be edited in the third pane.

As far as the subject-matter of claim 1 with regard to the technical features of the second pane can be understood, the technical function of the second pane as disclosed by document D1 and shown e.g. in figures 26 & 27 is regarded technically equivalent. Even if the non-technical, eventually unclear terms used in the claim could lead to slightly different interpretations, these interpretations lie well within the

capabilities of the person skilled in the art and would not result in the existence of an inventive step with regard to the functions of the second pane.

The search center user interface of D1 also comprises a third pane (figure 26, upper part of 2605), which may receive user input relating to the data objects selected in the second pane or simply display the data objects (figure 26, 2605: "Service Request: New, Edit").

In view of the user interface as disclosed by D1 and shown e.g. in figures 26 & 27, it must be stated that the subject-matter of claim 1 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

- 2.2 The method of displaying view sets, as described by claim 11, does not comprise the use of multiple panes. The described method comprises steps, which are clearly and unambiguously performed by the system of D1 comprising the above described user interface with multiple panes. They are therefore disclosed by D1, see cited passages, especially concerning the functions performed by the search center user interface, pages 44 ff.

Claim 11 can therefore not be regarded as new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

- 2.3 Claim 15 is referring to computer software to allow a processor to perform the steps of the method of claim 11, when executed. The subject-matter of claim 11 cannot be regarded as new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT, and therefore the computer software, which is simply a representation of the method in software terms, cannot be regarded as new, either.

3 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-10, 12-14, 16-18

- 3.1 Dependent claims 2-10 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).
- 3.2 Dependent claims 12 - 14 & 16 - 18 only contain features, which are either directly or inherently disclosed by D1, i.e. they are implicit to a person skilled in the art (see

PCT/GL/ISPE Chapter 12.01: "Meaning of Novelty).

Hence, claims 12 - 14 & 16 - 18 do not fulfill the requirements of Article 33(2) PCT.