

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

# PCT

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

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

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/US2018/033993

International filing date (day/month/year)  
23.05.2018

Priority date (day/month/year)  
28.06.2017

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
INV. G06Q10/10

Applicant  
MICROSOFT TECHNOLOGY LICENSING, LLC

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 usually 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:



European Patent Office  
P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2  
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas  
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040  
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Date of completion of this opinion

see form  
PCT/ISA/210

Authorized Officer

Fernández Ferreira

Telephone No. +31 70 340-0



---

**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 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:

---

**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)	Yes: Claims	<u>1-15</u>
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	<u>1-15</u>
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	<u>1-15</u>
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

ITEM V

- 1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter claimed does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.
- 2 The application relates to a method for annotating or associating information, for example emails, with stickers, much like paper-based, coloured stickers, but in an electronic virtual form, thus classifying the information for the user.
- 3 Consequently the application and its claims relates to the automation of an administrative manual/mental procedure. Prima facie, the automation of an administrative procedure cannot be considered as inventive for it corresponds to the natural technological evolution the skilled person is always striving for.
- 4 In particular claim 6 relates to such a method to be implemented in a computer system. At the level of abstraction of the claim (and the application as a whole) the implementation of the procedure defined in claim 6 would be an obvious task for a person skilled in the art aided by examples such as the ones disclosed in any of the documents D1-D5 (see passages cited in the search report). Consequently claim 6 is not considered to involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.
  - 4.1 Corresponding system claim 1 and computer-readable medium claim 15, are mutatis mutandis, not considered as inventive in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.
- 5 Dependent claims 2-5, respectively 7-14, are not considered as involving an inventive step either. The type of stickers to be used, and the association rules (stickers associated to emails and/or certain email fields), the manner in which the stickers are presented to the user (user interfaces for the user to choose a sticker) etc. are part of the specification of the procedure or related to presentation of information, thus entailing no inventive activity. Similarly to claim 6, the only technical problem which can be associated to these claims is the actual implementation, which is considered as an obvious task for a skilled person guided by examples as found in documents D1-D2, D4-D5.