

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)	12.11.2015
-------------------------------------	-------------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference p-0071	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
--	--

International application No. PCT/UA2015/000044	International filing date (day/month/year) 19.05.2015	Priority date (day/month/year) 20.05.2014
---	---	---

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
A01K31/06 (2006.01)

Applicant
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY "VYROBNYCHE OBEDNANNYA TEHNA"

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.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/RU	Date of completion of this opinion	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.		Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/UA2015/000044

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:
 - a. forming part of the international application as filed:
 - in the form of an Annex C/ST.25 text file.
 - on paper or in the form of an image file.
 - b. furnished together with the international application under PCT Rule 13ter.1(a) for the purposes of international search only in the form of an Annex C/ST.25 text file.
 - c. furnished subsequent to the international filing date for the purposes of international search only:
 - in the form of an Annex C/ST.25 text file (Rule 13ter.1(a)).
 - on paper or in the form of an image file (Rule 13ter.1(b) and Administrative Instructions, Section 713).
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 forming part of 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/UA2015/000044
--

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	1-3	YES
	Claims	_____	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	_____	YES
	Claims	1-3	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-3	YES
	Claims	_____	NO

2. Citations and explanations:	
--------------------------------	--

D1: US 4437433 A1
D2: SU 878180 A3

D1 discloses a battery of cages for rearing broilers (column 1, lines 5-68; column 2, lines 1-3 and 6-22; column 3, lines 40-48 and 53-60; column 4, lines 20-68; column 5, lines 1-34 and 40-53; column 7, line 17 - column 9, line 37; figures 1-3, 8, 10, 11 and 10c.), which contains a frame with tiers of cages (10) formed of transverse partitions; mesh cage floors (50, 70, 100, 87) which are movably installed in floor guides (77); and manure-removing conveyor belts (96), wherein the mesh cage floors are capable of moving in the middle of the frame, along the guides, in the direction of movement of the manure-removing conveyor belt, or in a direction contrary to the movement of the manure-removing conveyor belt.

The invention according to claim 1 differs from that known from D1 in that the cage floor moves until it fully exits the confines of the battery.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/UA2015/000044

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

Therefore, the invention according to claim 1 and dependent claims 2 and 3 satisfies the patentability criterion of novelty.

D2 discloses a battery of cages for rearing poultry (column 1, lines 1-4; column 2, lines 8-20; figures 1 and 2c.), in which the floor of the cages moves until it fully exits the confines of the battery.

Therefore, the invention according to claim 1 does not satisfy the patentability criterion of inventive step.

The features of claims 2 and 3 regarding the design of the mesh cage floors are known from D1 (column 4, lines 20-68; column 5, lines 1-6; figures 2, 10, 11 and 10c.).

Therefore, the invention according to claims 2 and 3 does not satisfy the patentability criterion of inventive step.

The invention according to claims 1-3 satisfies the patentability criterion of industrial applicability.