
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>3-12, 14-17, 20</u>
	No: Claims	<u>1, 2, 13, 18, 19</u>
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	<u>1-20</u>
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	<u>1-20</u>
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item VIII

- 1 The application does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT, because claims 1, 13 and 18 are not clear.
- 2 Present independent claims 1, 13 and 18 provide different versions of a computing system, an autonomous vehicle and a computer implemented method. The alternative definitions in said claims leave the reader in doubt as to what are in fact the essential features of the matter for which protection is sought and hence the primary purpose of Article 6 PCT is not satisfied.
- 3 Moreover, independent method claim 18 is considered to be the broadest claim, therefore should appear first in order not to mislead the reader about the scope of the claims.
- 4 Claims 1 and 13 could be made readily dependent on claim 18.

Re Item V

- 1 Reference is made to the following documents:
 - D1 US 2016/349750 A1 (NEMEC PHILIP [US] ET AL) 1 December 2016 (2016-12-01)
 - D2 US 9 551 992 B1 (BARTON-SWEENEY ANDREW [US] ET AL) 24 January 2017 (2017-01-24)
 - D3 US 2016/355192 A1 (JAMES MICHAEL R [US] ET AL) 8 December 2016 (2016-12-08)
- 2 D1 is considered to form the closest state of the art with respect to the current application.
- 3 The application does not meet the requirements of Article 33(2) PCT because the subject-matter of Claim 18 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT, in view of D1.
 - 3.1 D1 discloses a computer-implemented method (abstract), the method comprising:

- a. receiving, by a computing system comprising one or more computing devices, a user input indicative of an emergency event ([0003]); and
- b. in response to receiving, by the computing system, the user input indicative of the emergency event, causing, by the computing system, transition of a control of an autonomous vehicle from a primary motion plan to an emergency motion plan ([0018], [0082]);
- c. wherein the primary motion plan controls the autonomous vehicle towards a primary destination ([0005]); and
- d. wherein the emergency motion plan controls the autonomous vehicle to a safe state ([0017]).

3.2 Hence, the subject matter of claim 18 is not novel, Article 33(2) PCT.

4 The above novelty objection applies mutatis mutandis to independent claims 1 and 13.

5 The additional features set out in the dependent claims are either known from D1 or combination of D1-D3 or relate to usual matters of design which are unable to lend inventive step to the independent claims, Articles 33(2) and 33(3) PCT. In particular:

- The subject-matter of dependent claim 2 is shown also in D1 ([0022]), wherein an emergency motion plan is initiated after the user input indicative of an emergency event, and therefore not new (Article 33(2) PCT).

Re item VII

1 Certain defects in the international application:

1.1 The requirements of Rule 6.3(b) PCT are not met, because the independent claim is not properly cast in the two part form, with those features which in combination are disclosed by D1 being placed in the preamble.

1.2 The requirements of Rule 6.2(b) PCT are not met, because reference signs in parenthesis are not inserted in the claims.

- 1.3 The requirements of Rule 5.1 (a)(ii) PCT are not met, because the document D1 is not identified in the description and the relevant background art disclosed therein is not briefly discussed.
- 1.4 The requirements of Rule 9.1 PCT are not met, because the paragraphs ([0003], [0107]-[0108]) constitute unnecessary subject matter.