T 898/05, i.e. molecular, cellular and biological function in a broad sense (binding of a ligand, propagation of a transmembrane signal, role in a transduction signal pathway and/or in a network of interconnected pathways of a multicellular organism), could be directly derived from the application itself or from the prior art on file. Although, under certain conditions, the board was well prepared – following the case-by-case approach adopted in decision **T 898/05** – to acknowledge a possible function based on computer-assisted methods, in the case before it the probative value of these (sequence homology) methods was completely lacking. In the absence of this functional information, no "immediate concrete benefit" in the sense defined in decision **T 898/05** could be recognised for the CEGPCR1a clone disclosed in the application.

In **T 1452/06** the board commented that the basis for all the therapeutic indications of the claimed subject-matter was the predicted role of the purported serine protease activity of the polypeptide of sequence SEQ ID NO: 24 in the degradation of the extracellular matrix. No experimental evidence whatsoever was present in the application in support of a serine protease activity for a polypeptide comprising the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 24. There was no example disclosing this serine protease activity, nor any evidence showing that the screening methods and the therapeutic indications based on this serine protease activity could actually be achieved with a polypeptide of sequence SEQ ID NO: 24. The only use of a polypeptide of sequence SEQ ID NO: 24 was to find out more about the polypeptide itself and its natural function(s); this was a speculative outcome and therefore provided no "immediate concrete benefit" (**T 898/05**, **T 870/04**).