TRAITÉ DE COOPÉRATION EN MATIÈRE DE BREVETS

PCT

RAPPORT PRÉLIMINAIRE INTERNATIONAL SUR LA BREVETABILITÉ

(chapitre I du Traité de coopération en matière de brevets)

(règle 44bis du PCT)

Référence du dossier du déposant ou du mandataire 467-I53072WO DDL-VH	POUR SUITE À DONNER	Voir le point 4 ci-dessous			
Demande internationale no. PCT/FR2009/000158	Date du dépôt international (jour/mois/année) 12 February 2009 (12.02.2009)	Date de priorité <i>(jour/mois/année)</i> 14 February 2008 (14.02.2008)			
Classification internationale des brevets (8° edition, sauf indication d'une édition antérieure) Voir les informations pertinentes dans le formulaire PCT/ISA/237					
Déposant INNOVATRON					

1.	Le présent rapport préliminaire international sur la brevetabilité (chapitre I) est établi par le Bureau international au nom de l'administration chargée de la recherche internationale selon la règle 44 <i>bis</i> .1.a).					
2.	Ce RAPPORT comprend un total de 6 feuilles, y compris la présente feuille de couverture.					
	Dans les feuilles jointes, toute référence à l'opinion écrite de l'administration chargée de la recherche internationale doit être entendue, à la place, comme une référence au rapport préliminaire international sur la brevetabilité (chapitre I).					
3.	Le présent rapport contient des indications relatives aux points suivants :					
	X	Cadre n° I	Base de l'opinion			
		Cadre n° II	Priorité			
		Cadre n° III	Absence de formulation d'opinion quant à la nouveauté, l'activité inventive et la possibilité d'application industrielle			
		Cadre n° IV	Absence d'unité de l'invention			
	\boxtimes	Cadre n° V	Déclaration motivée selon l'article 35.2) quant à la nouveauté, l'activité inventive et la possibilité d'application industrielle; citations et explications à l'appui de cette déclaration			
		Cadre n° VI	Certains documents cités			
		Cadre n° VII	Certaines irrégularités relevées dans la demande internationale			
		Cadre n° VIII	Certaines observations relatives à la demande internationale			
4.	mais pas	avant l'expiration du	uniquera le présent rapport aux offices désignés conformément aux règles 44 <i>bis</i> .3.c) et 93 <i>bis</i> .1 délai de 30 mois à compter de la date de priorité (règle 44 <i>bis</i> .2), sauf si le déposant a présenté de n vertu de l'article 23.2).			

	Date d'établissement du présent rapport 28 September 2010 (28.09.2010)
Bureau international de l'OMPI 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Fonctionnaire autorisé Beate Giffo-Schmitt
no de télécopieur +41 22 338 82 70	e-mail: pt03.pct@wipo.int

Formulaire PCT/IB/373 (janvier 2004)

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY To: WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing see form PCT/ISA/210 (day/month/year) Applicant's or agent's file reference FOR FURTHER ACTION 467-I53072WO DDL-VH See paragraph 2 below International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) 14.02.2008 PCT/FR2009/000158 12.02.2009 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G06Q30/00 Applicant INNOVATRON 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 Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial Box No. V 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 FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that 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 3 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. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Name and mailing address of the ISA/EP Date of completion of this opinion Authorized officer Facsimile No. Telephone No.

International application No.

PCT/FR2009/000158

Box	No. I	Basis of this opinion
1.	With	regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	\boxtimes	the international application in the language in which it was filed
		a translation of the international application into, which is the language of a
		translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
2.		This opinion has been established taking into account the rectification of an obvious mistake authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43bis.1(a))
3.		a regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed ntion, 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
		on paper
		in electronic form
	c.	time of filing/furnishing
		contained in the international application as filed
		filed together with the international application in electronic form
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search
4.		In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) 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.
5.	Addi	itional comments:

International application No.
PCT/FR2009/000158

Box			the 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; oporting such statement	
	•	nauons sup	porting such statement	
1.	Statement			
	Novelty (N)	Claims	1-16	YES
		Clains		113
		Claims		NO
	Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
		Claims	1-16	NO
		Claims	- <u> </u>	. 110
	Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-16	VEC
	· · · · · · ·	Claims		YES
		Claims		NO
2.	Citations and explanations:			

- 1. The present application fails to comply with the requirements of PCT Article 33(1) since the subject matter of claims 1-16 does not meet the requirement of PCT Article 33(3) in respect of inventive step.
- 2. Claim 1
- 2.1 The subject matter of claim 1 relates to a method for receiving information relating to an Internet user. This method consists of presenting, to an Internet user needing to enter data on the page visited, not only a single input field, but a table including N functionally identical input fields and N pre-filled information fields ("qualifying information"). The qualifying information is not absolutely correlated with the data to be entered. As the Internet user can freely select an input field from the available N input fields, the solution proposed is based on

International application No. PCT/FR2009/000158

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

the hypothesis that the user will make the selection on the basis of his or her interest in the concept described in the corresponding information field.

- 2.2 The solution proposed by the present application is entirely on the basis of a hypothesis regarding the behaviour of the Internet user when selecting an input field. It is noted that this hypothetical behaviour is in no way guaranteed, as indicated in the description (page 7, lines 12-14). The Internet user can indeed select an input field on the basis of a plurality of criteria other than his or her interests, and even entirely randomly, in which case the problem addressed by the application is in no way solved. In every case, this solution is based on entirely non-technical considerations and is certainly not the work of a technical expert, but rather an expert in the field, for example, of behavioural psychology. As this solution is not technical, it is in itself excluded from the possibility of patentability and cannot therefore be taken into consideration in the assessment of an inventive step. Moreover, this solution should in fact be considered to be a prerequisite for a person skilled in the art for whom the technical problem addressed is the implementation by technical means of this nontechnical solution.
 - 2.3 However, the technical implementation of said solution as claimed, but also as disclosed in the

International application No. PCT/FR2009/000158

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

application as a whole, uses input fields as are well known in the field of web pages (in particular in online forms and/or search tools) and the normal interaction between the user and said fields. A person skilled in the art, having the non-technical solution at his or her disposal, would not have to exercise any inventive skill in order to develop the method as claimed. It is moreover noted that none of the technical means constituting the subject matter of the claim or cited in the application appear to have an unexpected technical effect, when considered alone or in combination.

- 2.4 Consequently, the subject matter of claim 1 is not inventive.
- 3. Dependent claims

Dependent claims 2-16 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, define subject matter which meets the requirements of the PCT in respect of inventive step, because they relate to implementation options that are obvious to a person skilled in the art (claims 2-16) or because they are obvious from the non-technical solution to be implemented (claims 9-10).