

**FD3 2016 – Amendment
Final mark scheme**

Main claim:	22 marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include sheet 5, antireflective or with antireflection coating, between perforated plate 3 and screen 6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Same but adding that it is flat (of uniform thickness). Max 13 o Just combining claims 1 and 5 Max 8 o Include sheet 5 but without specifying where it is located Max 11 o Claim to completely different feature, e.g. upstanding walls, modular construction Max 8 - Adjust references to light-emitting elements to “when assembled” or similar 4 	<p>Max 18</p> <p>Marks may be awarded for the “antireflective” claim presented as a divisional, up to a maximum of 10</p>
Subclaims, other claims:	13 marks
<p>Add claims to useful features, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Constitution of sheet 5, e.g. plastics, glass; anti-reflective coating (if not in claim 1) Max 4 - Sheet 5 is of uniform thickness/ flat 2 - Upstanding edges 3a of perforated plate 3 fitted to side plates of box 2 3 - Plate 3 (+ sheet) made of several components 7/28ff.; modular construction 2 - Claim(s) to (removable/screw-fixed) assembly of box + display board 5 	<p>But maximum of 13, considering the claims as a set, including any proposed divisional claim(s)</p>

FD3 2016 – Amendment
Final mark scheme

Letter to IPO:	35 marks
- Explain amendments (3) and their support (6):	9
- Refer to/ explain clarity point	2
- Novelty of claim 1 over D1 and D2 (including discussion of whether D1 implies a casing and whether D2 shows openings or a plurality of fins)	6
- Inventive step of the claims:	
o Structured approach (P/S or Pozzoli)	3
o discussion of D1 (main concern is thermal compatibility)	3
o discussion of D2 (e.g. position of sheet, only one fin for an array of LEDs)	3
o discussion of D1+D2, e.g. window 28 of D2 not compatible with lens sheet of D1, conflict of “transparent” and “opaque”; can D1 lens sheet be replaced or complemented by uniform sheet; thermal compatibility	8
o deal with all claims	1
Notes for client report:	30 marks
- Explain amendment chosen:	
o What was done.	4
o Why done – claim 1 probably not novel; alternatives considered, selection from list not emphasised in text itself, strength of argument, possible further backup positions, consequences of choice made	9
o Discussion of “antireflective sheet” vs. “anti-reflection coating” etc.	3
- Difficult to make claim 1 explicitly cover single horizontal slits in screen 6 but the existing wording arguably covers this	3
	5
- Coverage of claim to assembled display, reference to client’s plans	
- Discussion of considerations relating to possible (but unlikely) Divisional, e.g. to assembly of casing with sidewall construction	3
- timing of response	2
- Further issues, e.g. check status of D1	1