

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 513252/lg	FOR FURTHER ACTION		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/EP2017/001385	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 28 November 2017 (28.11.2017)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 02 December 2016 (02.12.2016)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant GIESECKE+DEVRIENT CURRENCY TECHNOLOGY GMBH			

<p>1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).</p> <p>2. This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.</p> <p>In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.</p>																								
<p>3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. I</td> <td>Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table> <p>4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																						

	Date of issuance of this report 04 June 2019 (04.06.2019)
The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Authorized officer Nora Lindner
Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	e-mail: pct.team5@wipo.int

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing <i>(day/month/year)</i> 02 March 2018	
Applicant's or agent's file reference 513252/ig	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/EP2017/001385	International filing date <i>(day/month/year)</i> 28 November 2017
Priority date <i>(day/month/year)</i> 02 December 2016	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC B65H 29/40(2006.01)i; B65H 29/00(2006.01)i; B65H 29/66(2006.01)i; G07D 11/00(2006.01)i	
Applicant GIESECKE+DEVRIENT CURRENCY TECHNOLOGY GMBH	

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 and 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/	Date of completion of this opinion	Authorized officer

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2017/001385

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.
 - 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 43*bis*.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 13*ter*.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 13*ter*.1(a)).
 - on paper or in the form of an image file (Rule 13*ter*.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/EP2017/001385

Box No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>1-7, 9-13</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>8</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	<u></u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1-13</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-13</u>	YES
	Claims	<u></u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations :

See Supplemental Box

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of:

Box V

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1	EP 1 413 539 A2 (TOKYO KIKAI SEISAKUSHO LTD [JP]) 28 April 2004
D2	EP 0 474 999 A1 (FERAG AG [CH]) 18 March 1992

1. INDEPENDENT CLAIMS

The patent application uses the term 'value document' almost throughout the entire application, whereas the Examiner uses the term 'document' throughout. In fact, no specific adaptations for value documents, in particular banknotes, are provided.

1.1 Claim 1

Document D2 discloses a device for storing documents (10) originating from a rotary printing press which is designed to receive documents (10) and to issue documents one after another (column 4, lines 17-39), the device comprising

- a transport apparatus (14) which is designed to receive documents (10) that are issued one after another, and to transport said documents such that they come to lie overlapping one another in a shingled manner (S, figure 1); and
- a storage apparatus (42) for storing the documents overlapping one another in a shingled manner (figure 4; column 5, lines 35-42).

The difference between claim 1 and D2 is that D2 does not explicitly disclose a stacking wheel like in D1 (abstract, paragraph 23, figure 2); however, such a stacking wheel is implicitly present, since the documents originate from a rotary printing press.

Therefore, claim 1 is not inventive (PCT Article 33(3)).

1.2 Claim 8

Document D2 discloses a storage apparatus (42) for storing documents (figure 11), the storage apparatus comprising

- at least a first supply spool (62) onto which a first storage film (63) is wound;
- a storage spool (30); and
- a feed unit (figure 11) which is designed to feed documents to be stored together with the first storage film (63) of the storage spool (30), in such a manner that the first storage film (63) can be wound onto the storage spool (30), together with the documents.

Therefore, claim 8 is not novel (PCT Article 33(2)).

1.3 Claim 13

Document D2 discloses a method for storing documents (10), the method comprising the following steps:

- Receiving documents in a rotary printing press (column 3, lines 28-31);
- delivering the [documents] delivered by the rotary printing press, one after another, to a transport apparatus (14) (column 3, lines 27-31);
- transporting the documents that were delivered one after another by the rotary printing press to the transport apparatus (14) by means of the transport apparatus such that the documents come to lie overlapping one another in a shingled manner (figure 2);
- arranging the value documents (S, figure 2) which are lying so as to overlap one another in a shingled manner, between at least a first storage film (26, 63) and a storage spool (48); and

Supplemental Box

- winding the value documents which are lying so as to overlap one another in a shingled manner, onto the storage spool (48) by means of the first storage film (26) (column 9, lines 6-43).

The remaining difference between claim 13 and D2 is that D2 does not specifically disclose the stacking wheel like in D1 (abstract, paragraph 23, figure 2); however, the stacking wheel is implicitly present, since the documents originate from a rotary printing press.

Therefore, claim 13 is not inventive (PCT Article 33(3)).

1.4 Claim 11

Document D2 discloses a document-processing system for processing, comprising a device for storing documents according to claim 1 (42, figure 11; column 8, lines 24-28).

Therefore, claim 11 is not inventive (PCT Article 33(3)).

2. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

2.1 Degree of overlap

Claim 2

Document D1 discloses a device comprising a control unit which is designed for controlling the transport apparatus (C) and/or the stacking wheel (3) such that the degree of the overlap of the documents coming to lie so as to overlap one another in a shingled manner is adjusted (D1: paragraphs 6 and 24). Therefore, claim 2 is not inventive (PCT Article 33(3)).

Claim 3

Document D1 discloses a device, wherein the control unit is designed to adjust a transportation speed at which the documents are transported by the transport apparatus (C), and/or a delivery rate at which the documents are delivered by the stacking wheel (3) such that a document received by the transport apparatus (C) is transported by the transport apparatus over a predetermined distance, before a subsequent value document is delivered by the stacking wheel and comes to lie on the value document (paragraph 23).

Therefore, claim 3 is not inventive (PCT Article 33(3)).

2.3 Claim 6

Document D2 discloses a device comprising

- at least a first supply spool (62) onto which a first storage film (63) is wound;
- a storage spool (48);
- a feed unit which is designed to feed documents which are lying so as to overlap one another in a shingled manner, together with the first storage film (28), to the storage spool (48), in such a manner that the documents which are lying so as to overlap one another in a shingled manner, are guided between the first storage film and the storage spool (figure 11; column 9, lines 7-8 and lines 24-42).

The difference between claim 6 and D2 is that D2 does not explicitly disclose a drive apparatus which is designed to bring the storage spool into rotation such that the first storage film which is fed to the storage spool, is wound onto the storage spool, together with the documents; however, such a drive apparatus is implicitly present. Therefore, claim 6 is not inventive (PCT Article 33(3)).

3. Corresponding features

Dependent claims 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, and 12 do not appear to contain any additional features which, in combination with the features of a claim to which they refer back, meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(3) in respect of inventive step, since these features are already known from documents D1 and D2, which are cited in the search report (housing for the storage spool (routine design measure), two transport apparatuses, two enveloping elements), or are considered obvious.