

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing (day/month/year) **See form PCT/ISA/210**

Applicant's or agent's file reference	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
---------------------------------------	--

International application No. PCT/IB2012/001340	International filing date (day/month/year) 05.07.2012	Priority date (day/month/year) 11.07.2011
---	---	---

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G09B23/26

Applicant
MOREAU, Pierre

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 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.

3. 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.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB2012/001340

Box No. I Basis of this 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
 - 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. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of a sequence listing filed or furnished:
 - a. (means)
 - on paper
 - in electronic form
 - b. (time)
 - in the international application as filed
 - together with the international application in electronic form
 - 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 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. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No. PCT/IB2012/001340
--

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		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	1-16	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-16	YES
	Claims		NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-16	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>1 Reference is made to the following documents:</p> <p>D1 DE 35 36 996 A1 (WURM WINFRIED DIPL ARCH) 13 March 1986 (1986-03-13)</p> <p>D2 WO 97/33670 A1 (HENRIQUES RABA RAOUL [FR]) 18 September 1997 (1997-09-18)</p> <p>D3 US 4 701 131 A (HILDEBRANDT PAUL R [US] ET AL) 20 October 1987 (1987-10-20)</p> <p>2 Novelty - Claim 1</p> <p>D1, which is considered to be the prior art closest to the subject matter of claim 1, discloses a modular system enabling the creation of assemblies of polyhedral atoms; see figures 1-28.</p> <p>The subject matter of claim 1 therefore differs from the teachings of D1 in that each of the vertices of the toric crown is specifically associated with five triangles of the torus; it is therefore novel.</p>			

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

3 Inventive Step - Claim 1

Proposing a model enabling the production of 3D tree structures would appear to equate to a technical problem. It would seem, however, that D1 already makes possible the production of such tree structures. The inventive step involved in the present application must therefore be seen in the fact that it offers an alternative embodiment.

NB: Aesthetic possibilities and considerations do not help to solve the technical problem and cannot be used as grounds for acknowledging an inventive step. The same applies to the intellectual considerations that might result from observing the claimed model.

4 Dependent claims

Dependent claims 2-16, which describe optional embodiments, must therefore likewise be considered novel and inventive.