

BOEHMERT & BOEHMERT Pettenkoferstraße 22 80336 München Germany

Europäisches Patentamt  
80298 München

Ihr Zeichen / your ref.  
**22 794 685.2**

Ihre Nachricht / your letter

Unser Zeichen / our ref.  
**H14345WOEP**

München  
**02.01.2025**

Dr. Matthias Hofmann  
Pettenkoferstraße 22  
80336 München  
Germany

T +49-89 559680  
F +49-89-559685090  
hofmann@boehmert.de  
www.boehmert.de

**European Patent Application 22794685.2**  
**DEVICE DISCOVERY METHOD, SYSTEM, AND**  
**ELECTRONIC DEVICE**  
**HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.**

In response to the Extended European Search report dated 19.08.2024, it is hereby indicated that the applicant wishes to proceed further with the European Patent Application.

It is requested to begin with the examination on the basis of new claims 1 to 10 replacing the claims on file, new description pages 1 to 4 and 4a replacing description pages 1 to 4 on file, and the remaining documents as currently on file.

## **I. Amendments**

New claim 1 has been amended to include "*the N second devices specifically comprise a second device on which a second application of preset version is installed in the M second devices; or the N second devices specifically comprise a second device on which the second application and an operating system of preset version are installed in the M second devices*", as disclosed in original claim 2.

New claim 1 has been amended to specify "*wherein the N second devices comprise a second device, in the M second devices*". This is merely a re-wording and does not alter the scope of the claim.

Previous claim 2 has been cancelled.

BOEHMERT & BOEHMERT Anwaltspartnerschaft mbB • Patentanwälte Rechtsanwälte • AG Bremen-PR 358 HB  
München • Bremen • Berlin • Düsseldorf • Frankfurt • Bielefeld • Alicante • Paris • Shanghai

Information about data protection and your rights as data subjects: [www.boehmert.com/data-protection](http://www.boehmert.com/data-protection)  
General terms and conditions: [www.boehmert.com/termsandconditions](http://www.boehmert.com/termsandconditions)

Dr. Ing. Karl Boehmert PA (1899–1973)  
Dipl.-Ing. Albert Boehmert PA (1902–1993)  
Wilhelm J. H. Stahlberg RA, Bremen  
Dr.-Ing. Walter Hoormann PA\*, Bremen  
Prof. Dr. Heinz Goddar PA\*, München, Shanghai  
Wolf-Dieter Kuntze RA, Bremen  
Dr. Ludwig Kouker RA, Bremen  
Dipl.-Ing. Eva Liesegang PA\*, Bielefeld  
Dr.-Ing. Matthias Philipp PA\*, Bielefeld  
Dr. Martin Vitz RA, Düsseldorf, Berlin  
Dr. Carl-Richard Haarmann RA, München, Düsseldorf  
Dipl.-Phys. Christian W. Appelt PA\*, München  
Dipl.-Phys. Dr.-Ing. Uwe Manasse PA\*, Bremen  
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Thomas L. Bittner PA\*, Berlin  
Dr. Volker Schmitz-Fohrmann, M. JUR. RA, München, Paris  
Dipl.-Biochem. Dr. Markus Engelhard PA\*, München  
Dipl.-Chem. Dr. Karl-Heinz B. Metten PA\*, Frankfurt  
Dr. Florian Schwab, LL.M. RA, Lie en droit, München  
Dr. Andreas Dustmann, LL.M. RA, Berlin, Alicante  
Dipl.-Chem. Dr. Volker Scholz PA\*, Bremen  
Dr. Martin Schaefer RA, Berlin  
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Michael Hartig PA\*, München, Paris  
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Steffen Schmidt PA\*, München  
Dr. Andreas Lucke PA\*, München  
Dipl.-Chem. Dr. Ute Kilger PA\*, Berlin  
Malte Nentwig, LL.M. RA, Bremen  
Dr. Rudolf Böckenholt, LL.M. RA, Bremen  
Peter Groß, LL.M. RA, München, Alicante  
Dipl.-Ing. Felix Hermann PA\*, München  
Dr. Michael Rüberg, LL.M. RA, München, Paris  
Dipl.-Phys. Christoph Angerhausen PA\*, Düsseldorf  
Dipl.-Inform. Dr. Jakob Valvoda PA\*, München  
Dipl.-Chem. Dr. Martin Erbacher PA\*, Bremen  
Dr. Daniel Herrmann PA\*, Frankfurt, München  
Dr. Sebastian Engels RA, Berlin  
Silke Freund RA, München  
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Matthias Hofmann PA\*, München  
Dr. Eckhard Ratjen, LL.M. RA, Bremen  
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Jin Jeon PA\*, München  
Dr. Mario Araujo\*\* PA\*, München  
—  
Dipl.-Ing. Oliver Tarvenkorn PA\*, Düsseldorf, Bielefeld  
Dr. Katrin Seibt RA, Bremen  
Dipl.-Biochem. Dr. Sibylla M. Grahn PA\*, München (2007–2024)  
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Xia Pfaffenzer PA\*, München  
Dipl.-Inform. Fritz Jetzek PA, Bremen  
Claudia Deppe RA, München  
Dr. Anja Ruge, LL.M. RA, Berlin, München  
Mehmet Bengi-Akyurek PA\*, München  
Dr. Lars Eggendorfer RA, München  
Dipl.-Ing. Dr. Sebastian Schlegel PA\*, Berlin  
Dipl.-Chem. Robert Bernin PA\*, Bremen  
Dipl.-Ing. Jan Göring PA\*, Frankfurt  
Dr. Laura Haas, M.Sc. PA\*, München  
Dr. Hanno Fientje PA\*, München  
Dr. Lara Gwinner PA\*, München  
Dr. Alexander Thamer RA, Berlin  
Dr.-Ing. Michael Rübsamen PA\*, München  
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Michael Lohse PA\*, München  
Dr.-Ing. Jonas Boschung, M.Sc., M.Sc. PA\*, Düsseldorf  
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Adrian Steffens PA\*, Berlin  
Melanie Müller RA, Bremen  
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. Giulio Schöber PA\*, München  
Micheline Verwohlt RA, München  
Nina Rücker RA, München  
Dr. Makiko Maruyama\*, M.Sc., München  
Théodore Ley\*, München  
Dr. Oleg Lebedev\*, Berlin  
Fabio Adinolfi RA, München  
Dipl.-Chem. Dr. José M. Pfizer PA\*, Berlin, München  
Matte Windeler, LL.M. oec. RA, Bremen  
Dipl.-Ing. Bernhard Jochim PA\*, Düsseldorf  
Dr. Julian Wernicke, LL.M. (UCT) RA, Berlin  
Dipl.-Phys. Dr. habil. Daniel Niesner PA\*, München  
Hannah Dauer, LL.M. RA, München  
Stella Euchner RA, München  
Dr. Jan Bohl, M.Sc. PA, Frankfurt  
Dr.-Ing. Dominik Denker, M.Sc. PA, Düsseldorf  
Victor V. Fetscher, LL.M. (Tel Aviv) RA, München  
Dr.-Ing. Thomas Michaelis PA\*, München

PA Patentanwalt/Patent Attorney \*European Patent Attorney  
RA Rechtsanwalt/Attorney at Law (Germany)  
\*\* Agente de la Propiedad Industrial (Spain) / Spain  
Vertretung vor dem EUIPO – Marken und Designs  
Representation at EUIPO – Trade marks and Designs

All claims have been re-numbered appropriately.

All claims have been provided with reference signs, where appropriate.

The description has been amended to acknowledge the prior art known from document D1. Furthermore, the description has been amended to reflect the amended claims.

Thus, all amendments meet the requirements of Art. 123(2) EPC.

## II. Clarity

In Section 1.1 of the European Search Opinion (ESOP), the Search Division argues that the expression “*the N second devices comprise a second device on which a second application is installed in the M second devices*” is not clear.

To proceed with the application in a favorable manner, claim 1 has been rephrased in the manner suggested by the Search Division in Section 1.1.

Thus, at least all new claims meet the requirements of Art. 84 EPC.

## III. Novelty and Inventive Step

As seemingly conceded by the Search Division in Section 3.2 of the ESOP, D1 does not disclose:

- a) *the N second devices specifically comprise a second device on which a second application of preset version is installed in the M second devices,*
- b) *the N second devices specifically comprise a second device on which the second application and an operating system of preset version are installed in the M second devices.*

Thus, the subject matter of claim 1 is new. The same considerations apply *mutatis mutandis* to claims 8, 9 and 10.

D1 is considered as closest prior art. D1 does not disclose the above-mentioned distinguishing features.

The distinguishing features have the technical effect that only those devices which have the necessary software compatibility are included in the filtered list of devices. This filtering mechanism based on either application versions or both application and

operating system versions guarantees that the selected devices can reliably support the functionalities required by the first application, thereby ensuring a seamless and improved user experience.

Therefore, the objective technical problem can be seen in how to improve a user experience when working with multiple devices.

The Search Division in Section 3.1 of the ESOP argues that the distinguishing features are obvious from D1.

The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Starting from D1, the skilled person with the objective technical problem in mind would find no hints towards the distinguishing features. Instead, D1 focuses primarily on application and device capability data. Specifically, par. [0112] of D1, as cited by the Search Division, discloses that application capability data comprises "*ability of an application to perform the particular task, the speed of an application, and/or other application performance data*" and device capability data comprises "*device memory, speed, and/or display capability*".

Therefore, starting from D1, the skilled person would be guided away from the distinguishing features and would, at best, arrive at an alternative solution where applications and devices with the most appropriate performance capabilities are selected. However, this would be significantly different from the claimed subject matter, which focuses on selecting devices based on either a preset version of an application or a preset version of an application and an operating system.

Thus, starting from D1, the skilled person would not arrive at the present invention.

The same considerations apply *mutatis mutandis* to claims 8, 9 and 10, which therefore also rely on an inventive step.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

In view of the amendments made and the above explanations, it is believed that the application is now in a state acceptable for grant. Should the Examining Division, nevertheless, still see deficiencies in the documents on file, it is kindly asked to give the applicant the opportunity to file further arguments and, if necessary, amendments. Minor issues could be discussed by telephone.

Only as a measure of precaution,

### **Oral Proceedings**

are herewith requested. In this event, it is further requested that the Oral Proceedings be either held in Munich, or by videoconference.

BOEHMERT & BOEHMERT



Dr. Matthias Hofmann

### **Enclosures:**

New claims 1 to 10, clean copy  
New claims 1 to 10, marked-up version  
New description pages 1 to 4 and 4a, clean copy  
New description pages, marked-up version