

PCT CH1 Stage		SIPO	EPO	JPO	USPTO	KIPO	COMMENTS SIPO	COMMENTS EPO	COMMENTS JPO	COMMENTS USPTO	COMMENTS KIPO
<b>EXAMPLE 1</b>	<p>The application comprises two independent claims:</p> <p><b>Independent claim 1:</b> A non-contact charger (A) for charging a battery of a mobile device, which is capable of wireless power transmission, comprising a universal serial bus (USB) connector (B) detachably connected to an external power supply and a backup battery circuit (C), whereby C solves the problem(X) of how to provide a charger which can charge a battery of a mobile device when an external power supply is not available.</p> <p><b>Independent claim 2:</b> A non-contact charger (A) for charging a battery of a mobile device, which is capable of wireless power transmission, comprising a universal serial bus (USB) connector (B) detachably connected to an external power supply and a mobile device ID detector (D), whereby D solves the problem (Y) of how to provide a charger which can identify a mobile device and provide a desired current/voltage to the battery of the mobile device</p>									Although USPTO indicated non-unity and that USPTO examiner would require additional fees for examples 1e, 1f, and 5f, USPTO would likely not raise an objection or require additional fees if the international application was limited to the claims presented in the examples. Noting the discussion in ISPE Guidelines paragraph 10.4, USPTO often will search and examine all claims even though they may technically lack unity since to raise an objection and require additional fees seems overly literal or academic.	
<b>Scenario 1A</b>	A+B is novel and inventive (the non-contact charger (A) with the USB connector (B) is novel and inventive). C and D are different. Problems X and Y are different.										
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	U	U	U	U	U					
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	N	N	N	N	N					
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	N					
<b>Scenario 1B</b>	D1 discloses a non-contact charger (A) with a USB connector (B) which can be connected to an external power supply, so A+B is known. C is novel. C and D are different. Problems X and Y are different.										
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	NU	NU	NU	NU					
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	R	R	R	R	R					
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention				Yes, unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention (A+B+D).
<b>Scenario 1C</b>	D1 discloses a non-contact charger (A). D2 discloses a charger with a USB connector (B) which can be connected to an external power supply. It would be obvious in view of D1 and D2 to provide a USB connector (B) to the non-contact charger (A), which would lead to a non-contact charger (A) with a USB connector (B). A+B is not inventive. C is novel. C and D are different. Problems X and Y are different.										
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	NU	When there is no prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with A+B U ----- When there is prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with A+B NU	NU	NU				*The prior art which is substantially identical with A+B means a prior art where the difference with A+B falls under either "addition, deletion, or replacement of a well-known or commonly used art to the prior art, which does not produce any new effects" or "a mere design variation of the prior art."	
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	R	R	When there is no prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with A+B N ----- When there is prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with A+B R	R	R				* With regard to "substantially identical", please refer to the column on the left.	
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	Y	Y	When there is no prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with A+B N ----- When there is prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with A+B Y	Y	Y	Unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention			* With regard to "substantially identical", please refer to the column on the left.	Yes, unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention (A+B+D).
<b>Scenario 1D</b>	D1 discloses a non-contact charger (A) provided with a backup battery circuit (C) and a USB connector (B) which can be connected to an external power supply, so A+B+C is known. C and D are different. Problems X and Y are different.										
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	NU	NU	NU	NU					
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	R	R	R	R	R					
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention				
<b>Scenario 1E</b>	D1 discloses a non-contact charger (A) with a USB connector (B) which can be connected to an external power supply, so A+B is known. D1 also discloses a non-contact charger with a backup battery circuit (C) and a mobile device ID detector (D). The embodiments in the description of the application lead to the conclusion that additional aspects of the backup battery circuit (C) and the mobile device ID detector (D) which make C and D novel and inventive over D1 are missing from the independent claims. C and D are different. Problems X and Y are different. C and D are also known from D1.  Fallback positions from the description concerning the first (A+B+C) and second (A+B+D) inventions are potentially novel and inventive.										
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	NU	NU	NU	NU					
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	N	R	R	R	R					
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	N	Only where an additional search effort is required. See also GL B-II, 3.2 (iv) which obliges EPO examiner to search potential fallback positions.	N	Y	N					Yes, unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention (A+B+D).
<b>Scenario 1F</b>	D1 discloses a non-contact charger (A) with a USB connector (B) which can be connected to an external power supply, so A+B is known. D1 also discloses a non-contact charger with a backup battery circuit (C) and a mobile device ID detector (D). It is not possible to identify any fallback positions in the description. C and D are different. Problems X and Y are different. C and D are also known from D1.										
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	Patentability issues take precedence. Application as a whole makes no technical contribution to the art.	NU	NU	NU					
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	N	N	R	R	N					
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	N	N	N	Y	N					
<b>EXAMPLE 2</b>	<p>The application comprises two independent claims:</p> <p><b>Independent claim 1:</b> A DC-DC converter (A) with a feedback control circuit (C), whereby C solves the problem (X) of how to provide a DC-DC converter which can output a required voltage.</p> <p><b>Independent claim 2:</b> A DC-DC converter (A) with a feedforward control circuit (D), whereby D solves the problem (Y) of how to provide a DC-DC converter which can output a required voltage.</p>										
<b>Scenario 2A</b>	D1 discloses a DC-DC converter (A), so A is known. The problem solved (how to modify a DC-DC converter to output a required voltage) is well known in the art. C is novel. C and D are different. C and D solve the same problem.										
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	NU	NU	NU	NU					
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	R	R	R	R	R					
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention				Yes, unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention (A+B+D).

EXAMPLE 3	<p><b>The application comprises two independent claims:</b>  <b>Independent claim 1:</b>  An interactive projector (A) capable of providing visual feedback corresponding to finger gestures of a user, comprising an infrared distance detector (C) for detecting a touch gesture, whereby C solves the problem (X) of how to provide a projector which can determine whether a touch gesture is made and provide visual feedback correspondingly.  <b>Independent claim 2:</b>  An interactive projector (A) capable of providing visual feedback corresponding to finger gestures of a user, comprising a finger-shadow identification module (D) for detecting a touch gesture, whereby D solves the problem (Y) of how to provide a projector which can determine whether a touch gesture is made and provide visual feedback correspondingly.</p>						
Scenario 3A	D1 discloses an interactive projector (A), so A is known. C is novel. C and D are different. However, C and D solve the same problem, i.e. X = Y. The problem solved (how to modify an interactive projector to detect a touch gesture and provide visual feedback correspondingly) is not known.						
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	U	U	U	NU	U	
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	N	N	N	R	N	
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	N	N	N	Y	N	
Scenario 3B	D1 discloses an interactive projector (A), so A is known. D1 also discloses that the interactive projector (A) includes a tactile sensor (F) for detecting a touch gesture. C is novel. C and D are different. C and D solve the same problem, i.e. X = Y. The problem solved (how to modify an interactive projector to detect a touch gesture and provide visual feedback correspondingly) is known from D1.						
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	NU	NU	NU	NU	
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	R	R	R	R	R	
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Yes, unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention (A+B+D).
Scenario 3C	D1 discloses an interactive projector (A), so A is known. D2 teaches how to incorporate an infrared distance detector (C) into an interactive system to determine whether a touch gesture is made and provide feedback correspondingly. The teaching of D2 makes the combination of A+C obvious. A+C is not inventive. C and D are different. C and D solve the same problem, i.e. X = Y. The problem solved (how to modify an interactive projector to detect a touch gesture and provide feedback correspondingly) is obvious over a combination of D1 and D2.						
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	NU	When there is no prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with the specific interactive projector (**) U ----- When there is prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with the specific interactive projector (**) NU	NU	NU	substantially identical with the specific interactive projector means a prior art where the difference with the specific interactive projector falls under either "addition, deletion, or replacement of a well-known or commonly used art to the prior art, which does not produce any new effects" or "a mere design variation of the prior art."  ** An interactive projector (A) capable of providing visual feedback corresponding to finger gestures of a user, comprising a means for detecting a touch gesture, whereby the means solves the problem (X=Y) of how to provide a projector which can determine whether a touch gesture is made and provide visual feedback correspondingly
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	R	R	When there is no prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with the specific interactive projector (**) N ----- When there is prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with the specific interactive projector (**) R	R	R	* With regard to "substantially identical", please refer to the column on the left.  ** With regard to "the specific interactive projector", please refer to the column on the left.
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	Y	Y	When there is no prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with the specific interactive projector (**) N ----- When there is prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with the specific interactive projector (**) Y	Y	Y	* With regard to "substantially identical", please refer to the column on the left.  ** With regard to "the specific interactive projector", please refer to the column on the left.  Yes, unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention (A+B+D).
EXAMPLE 4	<p><b>The application comprises two independent claims:</b>  <b>Independent claim 1:</b>  An outlet (A) with a latching structure (C), whereby C solves the problem (X) of how to secure a plug and an outlet together and prevent accidental disconnection.  <b>Independent claim 2:</b>  A plug (B) with an aperture structure (D) which matches the latching structure (C), whereby D solves the problem (Y) of how to secure a plug and an outlet together and prevent accidental disconnection.</p>						"Claims/Further details of scenarios" column: Regarding the limitations of Independent claim 2, does the limitation "aperture structure (D) which matches the latching structure (C)" imply that aperture structure (D) "mates with" latching structure (C)? We had difficulty answering the example 4 inquiries as it was unclear to what extent the aperture and latching structure matched.
Scenario 4A	D1 discloses an outlet (A) and a plug (B), so A and B are known. C is novel and inventive. C and D are different. However, C and D solve the same problem, i.e. X = Y. The problem solved (how to secure a plug and an outlet together and prevent accidental disconnection) is not known.						
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	U	U	U	U	U	
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	N	N	N	NR	N	
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	N	N	N	R	N	
Scenario 4B	D1 discloses an outlet (A) and a plug (B), so A and B are known. D1 also discloses a latching structure (E) (which is different from C, but which is suitable for latching with the aperture structure D). C is novel and inventive. D is not specially designed for C and can be used to match other types of latching structures. However, C and D solve the same problem, i.e. X = Y. The problem solved (how to secure a plug and an outlet together and prevent accidental disconnection) is known from D1.						
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	NU	Discretion – depends on extent of search carried out for common matter and teaching of application as a whole.	NU	NU	
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	R	R	R	R	R	
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	Y	Only where an additional search effort is required.	Y	Y	Y	Yes, unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention (A+B+D).
Scenario 4C	D1 disclose an outlet (A) with a latching structure, so A+C is known. D1 discloses a plug with a different aperture structure (F). A+C is not novel. D is novel. However, C and D solve the same problem, i.e. X = Y. The problem solved (how to secure a plug and an outlet together and prevent accidental disconnection) is known from D1.						
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	NU	NU	NU	NU	
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	R	Y	R	R	R	

QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	Y	Only where an additional search effort is required.	Y	Y	Y	Unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention			Yes, unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention (A+B+D).
<b>Scenario 4D</b>										
	D1 disclose an outlet (A). D2 teaches how to incorporate a latching structure (C) and an aperture structure (D) into all types of connectors to secure connection and prevent accidental disconnection. The teaching of D2 makes the combination of A+C obvious. A+C is not inventive. D is known. C and D solve the same problem, i.e. X = Y. The problem solved (how to secure a plug and an outlet together and prevent accidental disconnection) is known from D2.									
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	NU	When A+B and B+D are related intercomplementarily U ----- When A+B and B+D are not related intercomplementarily NU	NU	NU				
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	R	Possibly, but only in clear cases. Depends on teaching of application as a whole.	When A+B and B+D are related intercomplementarily N ----- When A+B and B+D are not related intercomplementarily R	R	R				
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	Y	N	When A+B and B+D are related intercomplementarily N ----- When A+B and B+D are not related intercomplementarily Y	Y	Y	Unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention			Yes, unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention (A+B+D).
<b>EXAMPLE 5</b>										
	<b>The application comprises one independent claim and two dependent claims:</b> <b>Independent claim 1:</b> A non-contact charger (A) for charging a battery of a mobile device, which is capable of wireless power transmission, comprising a universal serial bus (USB) connector (B) detachably connected to an external power supply. <b>Dependent claim 2</b> The non-contact charger (A) of claim 1 with a backup battery circuit (C), whereby C solves the problem (X) of how to provide a charger which can charge the battery of the mobile device when the external power supply is not available. <b>Dependent claim 3</b> The non-contact charger (A) of claim 1 with a mobile device ID detector (D), whereby D solves the problem (Y) of how to provide a charger which can identify a mobile device and provide a desired current/voltage to the battery of the mobile device.									
<b>Scenario 5A</b>	A+B is novel and inventive (the non-contact charger (A) with the USB connector (B) is novel and inventive). C and D are different. Problems X and Y are different.									
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	U	U	U	U	U				
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	N	N	N	N	N				
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	N				
<b>Scenario 5B</b>										
	D1 discloses a non-contact charger (A) with a USB connector (B) which can be connected to an external power supply, so A+B is known. C is novel. C and D are different. Problems X and Y are different.									
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	NU	NU	NU	NU				
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	R	R	R	R	R				
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention			Yes, unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention (A+B+D).
<b>Scenario 5C</b>										
	D1 discloses a non-contact charger (A). D2 discloses a charger with a USB connector (B) which can be connected to an external power supply. It would be obvious in view of D1 and D2 to provide the USB connector (B) to the non-contact charger (A), which would lead to a non-contact charger (A) with a USB connector (B). A+B is not inventive. C is novel. C and D are different. Problems X and Y are different.									
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	NU	When there is no prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with A+B U ----- When there is prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with A+B NU	NU	NU			* The prior art which is substantially identical with A+B means a prior art where the difference with A+B falls under either "addition, deletion, or replacement of a well-known or commonly used art to the prior art, which does not produce any new effects" or "a mere design variation of the prior art."	
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	R	R	When there is no prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with A+B N ----- When there is prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with A+B R	R	R			* With regard to "substantially identical", please refer to the column on the left.	
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	Y	Y	When there is no prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with A+B N ----- When there is prior art that is identical or substantially identical (*) with A+B Y	Y	Y	Unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention		* With regard to "substantially identical", please refer to the column on the left.	Yes, unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention (A+B+D).
<b>Scenario 5D</b>										
	D1 discloses a non-contact charger (A) provided with a backup battery circuit (C) and a USB connector (B) which can be connected to an external power supply, so A+B+C is known. C and D are different. Problems X and Y are different.									
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	NU	NU	NU	NU				
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	R	R	R	R	R				
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention			Yes, unless no additional effort is required to search the second invention (A+B+D).

Scenario 5E	<p>D1 discloses a non-contact charger (A) with a USB connector (B) which can be connected to an external power supply, so A+B is known. D1 also discloses a non-contact charger with a backup battery circuit (C) and a mobile device ID detector (D).</p> <p>The embodiments in the description of the application lead to the conclusion that additional aspects of the backup battery circuit (C) and the mobile device ID detector (D) which make C and D novel and inventive over D1 are missing from the independent claims. C and D are different. Problems X and Y are different. C and D are also known from D1.</p> <p>Fallback positions from the description concerning the first (A+B+C) and second (A+B+D) inventions are potentially novel and inventive.</p>								<p>Example 5e – last sentence of the "Stage of procedure/Scenarios" column: "...D1 are missing from the independent claims." Should be "...D1 are missing from the dependent claims." Several of our responses to the electrical examples may be seen as overly academic or literal. Although we indicated non-unity and that we would require additional fees for examples 1e, 1f, and 5f, we would likely not raise an objection or require additional fees if the international application was limited to the claims presented in the examples. Noting the discussion in ISPE Guidelines paragraph 10.4, we often will search and examine all claims even though they may technically lack unity since to raise an objection and require additional fees seems overly literal or academic.</p>
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	NU	NU	NU	NU			
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	N	Possibly, but only in clear cases. Depends on teaching of application as a whole.	R	R	R			
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	N	Depends on extent to which an additional search effort is required; Likely N.	N	Y	N			
Scenario 5F	<p>D1 discloses a non-contact charger (A) with a USB connector (B) which can be connected to an external power supply, so A+B is known. D1 also discloses a non-contact charger with a backup battery circuit (C) and a mobile device ID detector (D).</p> <p>It is not possible to identify any fallback positions in the description. C and D are different. Problems X and Y are different. C and D are also known from D1</p>								
QUESTION 1	Would your office consider these claims to be Unitary (U) or Non-Unitary (NU)?	NU	NU	NU	NU	NU			
QUESTION 2	Would your office raise an objection of non-unity at this stage (R=raise / N= not raise)	N	N	R	R	N			
QUESTION 3	Would your office request additional fees (Y/N)	N	N	N	Y	N			