

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 PCT3754.1	FOR FURTHER ACTION		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/ES2018/070007	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 05 January 2018 (05.01.2018)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant TANGO VOZ, S.L.			

<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 9 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																						

<p align="center">The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland</p> <p>Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70</p>	<p>Date of issuance of this report 07 July 2020 (07.07.2020)</p>
	<p>Authorized officer</p> <p align="center">Simin Baharlou</p> <p>e-mail: pct.team9@wipo.int</p>

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**
(PCT Rule 43*bis*.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/ES2018/070007

International filing date (day/month/year)
05.01.2018

Priority date (day/month/year)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
INV. G06Q10/06 G06Q10/10 G06F17/30 G11B27/02 G11B27/11

Applicant
TANGO VOZ, S L

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 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 66.1*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:



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

Maetz, Arnaud

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 English, 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>1-4</u>
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	<u>1-4</u>
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	<u>1-4</u>
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

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 V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1 US 2011/047625 A1 (STEELBERG RYAN [US] ET AL) 24
February 2011 (2011-02-24)

D2 US 2011/125653 A1 (CICCARELLI DAVID [CA]) 26 May 2011
(2011-05-26)

D3 US 2008/040141 A1 (TORRENEGRA ALEX H [US] ET AL) 14
February 2008 (2008-02-14)

2 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(3) PCT,
because the subject-matter of claims 1-4 does not involve an inventive step.

2.1 Claim 1:

2.1.1 D1 may be regarded as being the prior art closest to the subject-matter of
claim 1, and discloses:

A method for audio dubbing and voice-over (par.[0071] : "talent
to perform the voiceover") characterised in that it comprises:a.
generating in a server, to which at least one client has
access by means of a communication network, at least one
database (See configuration disclosed in par. [0012] and fig. 2)
comprising:

i. data on projects to be carried out (See voice over request
on par. [0073] and [0079]) , wherein said data in turn
comprise,

ii. data on roles of each client with access to the
server, wherein said data in turn comprise access
permissions to different features offered by the server
(see par. [0070] and [0071] : "advertiser access"/"system administrator" vs
"user"/"talent") ,

iii. data on proposals (See voice over request on par. [0073] and
[0079]) wherein said data comprise at least one delivery
date and given period of time (par. [0078] : "completion date"),

- b. generating a ~~series of n~~ proposals respectively intended for dubbing actors wherein said proposals comprise a delivery date or given period of time (see par. [0078] : definition of a voice over request) ,
- c. ~~sorting the n proposals following a hierarchical criterion,~~ **taking the preferred actor or actor matching the selection criteria as receiver for the proposal**
- d. sending the ~~first of the n~~ proposals from the server to a dubbing actor ~~located in the first of the n proposals,~~ (see pa.[0076] : "The information reviewed may be submitted in accordance with the steps illustrated by FIG. 5, wherein a requester may provide the mechanical aspects of the voiceover and the talent, or a representative thereof, may download the information and may be queued for action by the talent."
- e. ~~starting a countdown of a pre-set period of time when the receipt of the proposal is confirmed by the dubbing actor located in the first of the n proposals,~~
- f. determining the proposal as accepted when the dubbing actor responds to the proposal accepting it (see fig. 8 : Accepted date),
- g. generating a first timestamp corresponding to the time at which the dubbing actor responds to the proposal accepting it (see fig. 8 : Accepted date),
- h. establishing:
- i. ~~a first time counter with a start corresponding to the timestamp and a duration corresponding to the period of time determined in the proposal,~~ or
- ii. a second time counter, the end of which corresponds to the delivery date, (see fig. 8 : required completion date)
- i. receiving on the server a project carried out by the dubbing actor, corresponding to the proposal (see fig. 11 : "upload creative" and par. [0073]), and carrying out a second timestamp (implicit : content uploaded on a server is timestamped : standard feature of a file system) ,
- j. ~~comparing the second timestamp to at least one of the time counters, thus determining on-time delivery when the second timestamp is comprised within the limits of the~~

~~time counter,~~ and

k. enabling public access, subject to the entries in the role database on the server, to the work carried out by the dubbing actor, corresponding to the proposal, in order to carry out a quality control of the same based on the data (see fig. 11 : "obtain final approval [from administrator]")

- 2.1.2 In summary, D1 is directed to the same type of application (Finding an actor ready to accept a voiceover job with a certain deadline, getting and reviewing the work done).
- 2.1.3 The subject-matter of claim 1 distinguishes from D1 with 2 sets of features :
- set 1 : it generates several proposals and sends a first proposal to a first actor and it runs a countdown from the time the first actor received the proposal.
 - set 2 : it monitors whether the work is received on time by comparing the time stamp corresponding to the deadline and the time stamp when the work is actually received.
- 2.1.4 It is first noted that set 1 misses essential features. In view of the embodiment in the description supporting claim 1 (p.8, l.8-25), It is understood that the purpose of set 1 is basically to set a time limit for the first actor to answer and (this is the information missing) to send a proposal to the next actor in the hierarchy if the first actor has not accepted the work in due time. Without specifying the use of the countdown, running such countdown becomes useless. The same applies with the definition of n proposals if it is not defined how the 2nd and further proposals are eventually used. In the following, it will be taking account of these missing features.
- In D1 a first proposal is sent to a preferred actor who can accept or reject the proposal. No notion of deadline for accepting is disclosed.
- 2.1.5 Set 1 and Set 2 of features correspond to business needs (setting a time limit for accepting a proposal / determining if a work has been completed in due time) and are thus non technical motivations.
- 2.1.6 The technical problem(s) become(s) therefore :
- for set 1 : Implementing a rule for managing proposals for voice over tasks, wherein the rule (non technical constraint) is given and consists in setting a time limit for accepting this proposal running from the moment one actor

receives the proposal and if the proposal is not accepted within this time frame, sending a proposal to another actor.

- for set 2 : determining whether the due task has been received on time.

2.1.7 In view of these technical problems, the solutions proposed in claim 1 for the two partial problems are straightforward for the person skilled in the art.

2.1.8 The two partial problems being independent, it results that the subject-matter of claim 1 as a whole does not involve an inventive step over D1 (Art. 33(3) PCT).

2.2 Claim 2 :

Claim 2 does not define the reason why a countdown is started after one actor has accepted the proposal.

Even looking at the description and the embodiment disclosed in p.8, l.25-34 which relates to sending simultaneously proposals to different actors, the presence and use of a countdown is neither mentioned nor appeared to be needed in view of the rule to be applied. In particular, for the rule consisting of assigning the task to the first actor that accepts the proposal, there is no need for such countdown.

The subject-matter of claim 2 therefore lacks essential features (reason for having a countdown, how to select among accepted proposals) and is not supported by the description.

Now, interpreting the subject-matter of claim 2 in the light of the description and the embodiment given on p.8, l.25-34, the subject-matter of claim 2 does not involve an inventive step under Art. 33(3) PCT, for the same reasons as the ones provided with respect to claim 1 (obvious implementation considering a given non-technical constraint, e.g. rule set for sending proposals and selecting among accepted proposals).

2.3 Dependent claims 2-4 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of inventive step (Art. 33(3) PCT) :

- It is at least implicit from the way the platform works in D1 (See fig. 8,9, 11

and is managed that databases of talents (fig.11 : "talent list selection" and par. [070] : "accessible voiceovers may be limited by talent, subject or other vault tracked parameters and par. [071] selecting a particular talent based on certain criteria), these operations typically involving a database) , voice over requests (and possibility to order these requests and filtering them, see par. [0071]) are involved. Organizing the data in different databases on a single server or a plurality of servers are mere design possibilities well known for the person skilled in the art.

- 2.4 For the sake of completeness, it is noted that D2 and D3 are documents generally dealing with the same context (sending/accepting proposals for voiceover requests) with deadlines to answer to the proposals and to perform the due task (it further includes a negotiation phase to select among the users that responded on time to the proposal). The difference between the claimed subject-matter and the disclosure of said documents is therefore the same as in the case of D1. Therefore, applying the same line of reasoning, the subject-matter of claims 1-4 would no involve an inventive step over D2 or D3 (Art. 33(3) PCT).

3 **Re Item VIII**

Certain observations on the international application

- 3.1 Claim 2 is not supported by the description as required by Article 6 PCT, see observations with respect to item V.
- 3.2 Claims 1,2 do not contain all the technical features essential to the definition of the invention (See observations with respect to item V), and therefore do not meet the requirement following from Article 6 PCT taken in combination with Rule 6.3(b) PCT.