PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing See form PCT/ISA/210 (day/month/year) Applicant's or agent's file reference FOR FURTHER ACTION P9894pct See paragraph 2 below International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) PCT/AT2005/000255 07.07.2005 28.07.2004 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC B61D15/06, B61D17/06, B61F1/10 Applicant SIEMENS TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS GMBH & CO KG 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 Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial Box No. V 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 **FURTHER ACTION** If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will 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 66.1bis(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. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Authorized officer Name and mailing address of the ISA/EP Facsimile No. Telephone No.

Box	No. 1	Basis of this opinion
1.		regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was unless otherwise indicated under this item.
		This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under
	-	Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2.		regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed ation, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a.	type of material
		a sequence listing
	•	table(s) related to the sequence listing
	b.	format of material
		in written format
		in computer readable form
	c.	time of filing/furnishing
		contained in the international application as filed.
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.		In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4.	Add	tional comments:

Box No. II Priority						
The following document has not yet been furnished:						
copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).						
translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis. 1 and 66.7(b)).						
Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on						
the assumption that the relevant date in the claimed priority date.						
2. This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.						
3. Additional observations, if necessary:						
The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because						
the International Searching Authority does not have in its						
possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been						
claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier						
application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the						
assumption that the relevant date (Rules $43bis$ 1 and 64.1) is the						
claimed priority date.						
·						
·						
·						
·						
·						

		HING AUTHORI				005/0002	
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							
. Statement							
Novelty (N)	Claims	3-5					YE
• • •	Claims	-1-2					– ''' NO
					•		_
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	3-5					_ YE
	Claims	1-2					NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-5					YE
	Claims						NO
. Citations and explanations:							
See supplementa	l shee	et					
•							
				•			
,							
		•			•		
·							
		•			•		
							•

. Box	No. V1 Certain documents cited	•		
1.	Certain published documents (Rule 43bis.1 and 70	.10)		
	Application No. Patent No.	Publication date (day/month/year)	Filing date (day/month/year)	Priority date (valid claim) (day/month/year)
		,		
	·			
<u> </u>				
2.	Non-written disclosures (Rule 43bis.1 and 70.9)		D:	ate of written disclosure
	Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-written d (day/month/yea	isclosure referri	ng to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
	•			
				•
	•			
			·	·
Se	ee form 210			

Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application							
The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:								
See	supplemental	sheet	•					
							-	
					,			
	·							
				•				
					٠			
							•	
							•	
								•
					•			
				-				

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	supplemental	sheet				
		·				
·						
1						

International application No.
PCT/AT2005/000255

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient. Continuation of:

Boxes V, VII and VIII

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: WO 2004/110842 A (2004-12-23)

D2: EP-A-1 006 034 (2000-06-07)

D3: EP-A-1 394 009 (2004-03-03)

2. The subject matter of claim 1 does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(1).

Document D2 is considered to be the closest prior art. It discloses a rail vehicle having a climbing guard (figure 1C) which is arranged at an end region of the vehicle and extends essentially over the entire width of the vehicle.

In the present claim it is also specified that at least one anti-climbing element which partially extends the length of the climbing guard in the vertical direction is arranged at the end region of the rail vehicle, it being possible to place said anti-climbing element in engagement with the climbing guard of another rail vehicle in the event of an impact.

In view of the details in the description (page 4) according to which the climbing elements functionally form an extension of the climbing guard, also have ribs and can be constructed in one

International application No.
PCT/AT2005/000255

Supplemental Box

piece with the climbing guard, it is necessary to assume that the additional features of claim 1 are also disclosed in D2: in figure 1C the two lower ribs form a climbing guard which is extended by an anti-climbing element (upper rib) in the vertical direction.

The subject matter of independent claim 1 is thus not novel (PCT Article 33(2)).

- 3.1 The additional features of claim 2 are likewise disclosed in D2 (figure 1C).
- 3.2 The subject matter of claim 3 is unclear. In the claim there is no information which would allow a person skilled in the art to understand how a climbing element arranged in the interior of an impact pillar can engage with the climbing guard. In a clarified form (see for example page 4, fifth paragraph "are ... in a preferred ...") this claim would be expected to meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(3).
- 3.3 Claims 4 and 5 ought to refer back to claim 3 (see feature "impact pillar"). In a clarified form they would also meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(1).
- 4. If amendments are submitted, PCT Article 34(2)(b) must be taken into account in all cases and the principles from the originally submitted letters for the amendments must be specified in the accompanying

International application No.
PCT/AT2005/000255

Supplemental Box

letter or in handwritten form on copies of the relevant parts. The amendments are to be submitted on replacement pages as prescribed in PCT Rule 66.8(a).

It is also necessary to take into account the fact that contrary to PCT Rule 5.1(a) (ii) D1 and D2 are neither cited nor briefly described in the description.

5. Pursuant to PCT Rule 70.10, D1 is cited under PCT Rule 64.3. This is to be taken into account when the European phase is entered.