The examination is being carried out on the **following application documents**

Description, Pages

5-36   filed with entry into the regional phase before the EPO

1-4, 4a   filed in electronic form on   02-01-2025

Claims, Numbers

1-10   filed in electronic form on   02-01-2025

Drawings, Sheets

1/14-14/14   filed with entry into the regional phase before the EPO

Reference is made to the following document; the numbering will be adhered to in the rest of the procedure.

D1   WO 2016/040721 A1 (MICROSOFT TECHNOLOGY LICENSING LLC [US]) 17 March 2016 (2016-03-17)

1   Executive Summary

1.1   Claim 1 on file corresponds to former claim 1 adding the subject matter of former dependent claim 2; besides 1 editorial amendment has been made resulting in now reading, in the claim, "...wherein the N second devices comprise a second device, in the M second devices, on which a second application is installed,..."

1.1.1   Former claim 1 is the originally filled claim 1 which, in its turn, corresponds to the English translation of the PCT published claim 1.

1.2   There is a clarity issue in claim 1, concerning "a second application" see section 3.1.

1.3   In so far the claim can be understood, it is considered not inventive in view of D1, see section 2.

2   Inventive Step of independent claims (Art. 52(1) and 56 EPC)

2.1   Furthermore, notwithstanding the below-mentioned lack of clarity, the subject-matter of claim 1 does not involve an inventive step within the meaning of Article 56 EPC, and the requirements of Article 52(1) EPC are therefore not met.

2.1.1   Claim 1 on file corresponds with former claim 1 adding the subject matter of
former dependent claim 2 (see section 1.1). In the previous action of the office
(search of the application) claim 2 was considered obvious in view of D1. In his
letter dated 02.01.2025 the applicant arguments why the features of former
claim 2 are new and inventive; this is respectfully disagreed.

In the ESOP, when mapping D1 to the feature of former (and current) claim 1
**"displaying, by the first device, identifiers of N second devices in
response to an operation performed on one of the at least one control,
wherein the N second devices comprise a second device on which a
second application is installed in the M second devices, and the second
application and the first application provide a same resource; and"**
paragraphs 108-117 of D1 were cited those reading:
*(paragraph [00108] - paragraph [00117]: At block 606 the model remote control
module on the source device can send an application discovery query message
to one or more trusted remote devices. The application discovery query can
include a request for application capability data on the one or more trusted
devices, including the ability of an application to perform a particular task, the
speed of an application, and/or other application performance data. The
application discovery query can further include a request for device capability
data, such as device memory, speed, and/or display capability, for the one or
more trusted devices.)*
*(paragraph [00108] - paragraph [00117]: At block 608, responsive to the
application discovery query, the model remote control module on the source
device receives a discovery response message. The discovery response
message can include an indication of at least one application capable of
performing the task on the one or more trusted remote devices, application
capabilities for the at least one application, and/or device capabilities for the one
or more trusted remote devices. In some examples, the one or more discovery
response messages can include a notification that a remote device and/or
application on a remote device is not capable of executing the task.
At block 610, the model remote control module on the source device can
receive a plurality of discovery response messages. A remote application
discovery client can process the plurality of discovery response messages, and
send remote application files to a remote application file limiter, such as remote
application file limiter 408.)*

Current claim 1 adds the features of former claim 2 (see 3.1) which add further limitations to the second device via further limiting the second application with an alternative with two options: "**wherein 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;**"

From the applicant's letter dated 02.01.2025, this feature mapping does not seem contested.

The applicant derives a technical effect from the added feature to claim 1 (coming from former claim 2) and also the corresponding technical problem:

"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 skilled person, departing from D1 and faced to the above mentioned problem, knows that, to ensure compatibility between devices and applications, application and device capabilities need to be taken into account and D1 does take this into account as per the mentioned paragraphs *(paragraph [00108] - paragraph [00117])*. That the application capability is designed to further explicitly include the application's version is commonly known since version compatibility of applications is a commonly present problem to the public. Therefore, the skilled person, departing from D1 and faced to the above mentioned problem, would find natural to enhance D1 with this obvious (if not implicit feature) of considering also application version among application's capabilities, therefore arriving, without exercising any inventive skills to the solution of the claim (1st option of the alternative present in the claim).

3   Clarity, conciseness and support (Art. 84 EPC)

3.1 Claim 1 reads: "

A device discovery method, wherein the method comprises:

...

displaying, by the first device, identifiers of N second devices in response to an operation performed on one of the at least one control, wherein the N second devices comprise a second device, in the M second devices, on which a second application is installed, and the second application and the first application provide a same resource; wherein
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;"

So, when reading "*second device on which a second application of preset version is installed in the M second devices;*" it is not known if the "*a second application*" refers to the previous second application in "*on which a second application is installed,*".

3.1.1 The claim has been interpreted in the lines of "*the N second devices specifically comprise a second device on which the second application is further of a preset version*", see section 2

3.1.2 *Note that the feature in question is originally from dependent claim 2 (see section 1.1) and this deficiency should have already been identified in the previous action of the office.*

3.2 *Claim 1 reads: "*
wherein the N second devices comprise a second device, in the M second devices, on which a second application is installed, and the second application and the first application provide a same resource;
wherein 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;"

To harmonise the drafting of the claim and make it more understandable, it is suggested to draft it (see also section 3.1) as: "
wherein the N second devices specifically comprise a second device, in the M

*second devices, on which a second application of preset version is installed;
or the N second devices specifically comprise a second device, in the M second
devices, on which the second application and an operating system of preset
version are installed;"*

4 Further Objections

4.1 The features of the claims should be provided with reference signs placed in parentheses to increase the intelligibility of the claims (Rule 43(7) EPC). This applies to both the preamble and characterising portion (see EPC Guidelines F-IV, 4.18).

4.2 The statement in the description, page 1, 1st paragraph, concerning the incorporation of cited document by reference should be removed (GL. Part F, Chapter III-8).