BRYN AARFLOT

EST. 1947

Patentstyret Styret for det industrielle rettsvern Postboks 4863 Nydalen 0422 Oslo

Oslo, 16 April 2020 Your ref.: Our ref.: 132068/DM0/DM0

Patent application no. 20181333 Harbin Engineering University et al.

Dear sir/madam,

We would like to thank NIPO for the official action, dated 3 February 2020, and the analysis forwarded therein. In this letter we present our reply to the formal objection raised in the official action, setting out our arguments below.

Formal objection

The official action recites one formal objection, stating that independent claims 1 and 14 are in the same claim category, which is deemed unallowable in the present case (patent regulations, sec. 7; guidelines C III, 3.1.2).

We politely traverse this opinion, noting the following:

Under guidelines C III, 3.1.2, item c), multiple independent claims in the same category are allowable if these represent alternative solution to the same problem. We wish to stress that this is the case for the present application, given that in the alternative of claim 1 "the turret is adapted to be moored to the seabed", whereas in the alternative of claim 14 "the lower part of the grid-frame structure comprises anchor chains". Consequently, claims 1 and 14 define alternative solutions for mooring the module-based marine fish platform to the seabed, thereby falling under the exception of guidelines C III, 3.1.2 item c).

Conclusion

Given that no further formal or substantive objections remain, given that a positive opinion on patentability was already established in the office action dated 17 July 2019 and given that the application documents currently on file are in a print-ready form, we kindly request the grant of a patent under patent act, sec. 19. Should the examiner nevertheless conclude that further issues need to be addressed, we respectfully request a further communication under patent act sec. 15 (guidelines D III, 1, 2nd sentence).

Yours sincerely, Bryn Aarflot AS



David Molenaar