

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

Inspicos P/S
Kogle Alle 2
DK-2970 Hørsholm
Denmark

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43*bis*.1)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	19/12/2018
-------------------------------------	------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See paragraph 2 below
21346PCT00		
International application No.	International filing date (day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)
PCT/DK2018/050234	26/09/2018	26/09/2017
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC		
G06Q 10/06 (2012.01), G06Q 10/10 (2012.01)		
Applicant		
Portfolio Planner ApS		

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 43*bis*.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 66.1*bis*(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/ Nordic Patent Institute Helgeshøj Allé 81 DK - 2630 Taastrup, Denmark Facsimile No. + 45 43 50 80 08	Date of completion of this opinion (day/month/year) 18/12/2018	Authorized officer Bo Gram-Nielsen Telephone No. +45 43 50 82 06
---	--	--

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/DK2018/050234

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.Section713)
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/DK2018/050234

Box No. II

Priority

1. The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority does not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.
2. This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

the entire international application.

claims Nos.

because:

the said international application, or the said claims Nos. _____ relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international search (*specify*):

the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. _____ are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. _____

a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the sequence listing; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit:

furnish a sequence listing in the form of an Annex C/ST.25 text file, and such listing was not available to the International searching authority in the form and manner acceptable to it; or the sequence listing furnished did not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions.

furnish a sequence listing on paper or in the form of an image file complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching authority in the form and manner acceptable to it; or the sequence listing furnished did not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions.

pay the required late furnishing fee for the furnishing of a sequence listing in response to an invitation under Rules 13ter.1(a) or (b).

See Supplemental Box for further details.

Box No. IV **Lack of unity of invention**

1. In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees the applicant has, within the applicable time limit:
 - paid additional fees.
 - paid additional fees under protest and, where applicable, the protest fee.
 - paid additional fees under protest but the applicable protest fee was not paid.
 - not paid additional fees.

2. This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.

3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is:
 - complied with.
 - not complied with for the following reasons:

4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
 - all parts.
 - the parts relating to claims Nos.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/DK2018/050234

Box No. V Reasoned statement under 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

I. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-15	YES
	Claims	_____	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-15	YES
	Claims	_____	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-15	YES
	Claims	_____	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

D1: US 2007/0150327 A1 (DROMGOLD) 2007.06.28.

NOVELTY (Article 33(2) PCT):

D1 discloses in paragraphs [0127]-[0128] and figure 4 a method comprising the steps of:

- Obtaining first project data (84, 86) in a first data format generated by a first project management computer program ("*originating project management system*"), where the first project data comprises activity data ("*tasks, time dependencies*"),
- Obtaining second project data (88) in a second data format generated by a second project management computer program ("*another project management system*"), where the second project data comprises activity data,
- Deciphering the first project data and the second project data (82);
- Simultaneously visualizing (90) the first project data and the second project data in a single graphical user interface see figures 3c and 3d.

The subject matter of claim 1 differs from D1 in that the first project data comprises first project activity data defining a plurality of first project activities, at least one first project activity defining at set of activity parameters including at least start and finish time, budgeted units and/or one or more resources;

- the second project data comprises second project activity data defining a plurality of second project activities, at least one second project activity defining at set of activity parameters including at least start and finish time, budgeted units and/or one or more resources; and
- the first data format being incompatible with the second project management computer program and the second data format being incompatible with the first project management computer program.

The subject matter of the independent claim 1 and the dependent claims 2-15 is therefore novel.

INVENTIVE STEP (Article 33(3) PCT):

The problem addressed by the subject matter of claim 1 may be considered to be providing an improved method of simultaneous visualising management information deriving from a plurality of mutually incompatible project management computer programs.

We consider that the person skilled in the art of visualising management information who would like to solve the above mentioned problem would not be inspired by this specialist knowledge to suggest the solution mentioned in claim 1 of your application.

The subject matter of claim 1 and the dependent claims 2-15 therefore differs essentially from the prior art.

INDUSTRIAL APPLICABILITY (Article 33(4) PCT):

The subject matter of claims 1-15 is considered applicable for industrial use.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/DK2018/050234

Box No. VI **Certain documents cited**

1. Certain published documents (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 70.10)

Application No.
Patent No.

Publication date
(*day/month/year*)

Filing date
(*day/month/year*)

Priority date (valid claim)
(*day/month/year*)

2. Non-written disclosures (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 70.9)

Kind of non-written disclosure

Date of non-written disclosure
(*day/month/year*)

Date of written disclosure
referring to non-written disclosure
(*day/month/year*)

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

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

1. The independent claim is not in the two-part form in accordance with Rule 6.3 PCT, which in the present case would be appropriate, with those features known in combination from the prior art (document D1) being placed in the preamble (Rule 6.3(b)(i) PCT) and with the remaining features being included in the characterising part (Rule 6.3(b) (ii) PCT).

2. The features of the claims are not provided with reference signs placed in parentheses (Rule 6.2(b) PCT and the Guidelines, PCT/GL/ISPE/1 5.11

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/DK2018/050234

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:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/DK2018/050234

Supplemental Box

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