Internal distribution code:

(A) [-] Publication in OJ
(B) [-] To Chairmen and Members
(C) [-] To Chairmen
(D) [X] No distribution

Datasheet for the decision of 11 November 2025

Case Number: T 0468/25 - 3.5.05

Application Number: 18928650.3

Publication Number: 3826353

IPC: H04W24/10, H04B17/327

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:
Method for reporting measurement quantities, method for determining measurement quantities, and devices

Applicant:
GUANGDONG OPPO MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORP., LTD.

Headword:
Reporting mobile measurement quantities/GUANGDONG

Relevant legal provisions:
EPC Art. 84, 111(1), 123(2)
RPBA 2020 Art. 11

Keyword:

Added subject-matter - main request (no)
Sufficiency of disclosure and clarity - main request (yes)
Remittal to the examining division for further prosecution - main request (yes): novelty and inventive step not yet finally assessed

Europäisches Patentamt
European Patent Office
Office européen des brevets

Beschwerdekammern

Boards of Appeal

Chambres de recours

Boards of Appeal of the
European Patent Office
Richard-Reitzner-Allee 8
85540 Haar
GERMANY
Tel. +49 (0)89 2399-0

Case Number: T 0468/25 - 3.5.05

D E C I S I O N
of Technical Board of Appeal 3.5.05
of 11 November 2025

Appellant: (Applicant)	GUANGDONG OPPO MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORP., LTD. No. 18, Haibin Road Wusha Chang'an Dongguan Guangdong 523860 (CN)
Representative:	Penza, Giancarlo Bugnion S.p.A. Viale Lancetti, 17 20158 Milano (IT)
Decision under appeal:	**Decision of the Examining Division of the European Patent Office posted on 5 December 2024 refusing European patent application No. 18928650.3 pursuant to Article 97(2) EPC.**

Composition of the Board:

Chair	K. Bengi-Akyürek
Members:	K. Schenkel
	C. Heath

Summary of Facts and Submissions

I. The appeal is against the decision of the examining division to refuse the present European patent application. The refusal was based on the ground that the then main request did not comply with Articles 84 and 123(2) EPC. An auxiliary request was not admitted into the proceedings on the ground that it did not overcome the objection under Article 84 EPC.

II. With its statement setting out the grounds of appeal, the appellant requested that the appealed decision be set aside and that a patent be granted on the basis of a **main request** or either of **auxiliary requests 1 and 2.**

III. In a communication under Article 15(1) RPBA, the board expressed its preliminary view that the main request and the auxiliary requests did not comply with Article 123(2) EPC, but that the claims of the main request overcame the objections raised under Article 84 EPC. The board further indicated that, if the objection under Article 123(2) EPC regarding the main request was overcome by amendment or arguments, it would be minded to remit the case to the examining division for further prosecution.

IV. Thereafter, the appellant filed an auxiliary request 3 and changed the order of the requests making auxiliary request 3 the main request and shifting the former main request and auxiliary requests 1 and 2.

V. Oral proceedings arranged before the board were then cancelled.

VI. Claim 1 of the **main request** (filed as "auxiliary request 3") reads as follows (board's labelling):

(a) "A method for reporting measurement quantities, comprising:
(b) determining (S210), by a terminal device, measurement quantities of K signals, wherein the K signals are carried on beams, wherein the measurement quantity comprises a signal to interference plus noise ratio, SINR; and
(c) reporting (S220), by the terminal device, the measurement quantities of the K signals to a network device, wherein K is a positive integer;
(d) wherein reporting, by the terminal device, the measurement quantities of the K signals to the network device comprises:
(e) according to a corresponding relationship between the measurement quantities and bit values, determining, by the terminal device, a bit value corresponding to the measurement quantity of each signal of M signals in the K signals;
(f) reporting, by the terminal device, the bit value corresponding to the measurement quantity of each signal of the M signals in the K signals to the network device, wherein M is a positive integer and K>M;
(g) wherein reporting, by the terminal device, the measurement quantities of the K signals to the network device comprises:
(h) according to measurement quantities of at least part of the M signals and measurement quantities of (K-M) signals, determining, by the terminal device, a bit value corresponding to the measurement quantity of each signal of the (K-M) signals; and

(i) reporting, by the terminal device, the bit value corresponding to the measurement quantity of each signal of the (K-M) signals to the network device;

(j) wherein determining, by the terminal device, a bit value corresponding to the measurement quantity of each signal of the (K-M) signals, comprises:

(k) generating, by the terminal device, a difference of a SINR value of each signal of the (K-M) signals in a differential manner according to SINR values of at least part of the M signals and the SINR values of the (K-M) signals;

(l) determining, by the terminal device, a bit value corresponding to the difference of the SINR value of each signal of the (K-M) signals according to a corresponding relationship between differences and bit values; and

(m) determining, by the terminal device, the bit value corresponding to the difference of the SINR value of each signal of the (K-M) signals as the bit value corresponding to the measurement quantity of each signal of the (K-M) signals;

(n) wherein generating, by the terminal device, a difference of a SINR value of each signal of the (K-M) signals in a differential manner according to the SINR values of at least part of the M signals and the SINR values of the (K-M) signals comprises:

(o) respectively differentiating, by the terminal device, the SINR values of the (K-M) signals with the SINR value of one signal of the M signals to generate a difference of the SINR value of each signal of the (K-M) signals;

(p) wherein the K signals comprise a synchronization signal block, SSB, and/or a channel state information reference signal, CSI-RS, the SINR is a L1, layer 1, -SINR."

Reasons for the Decision

1. Background of the invention

The present invention relates in general to the field of wireless communication and in particular to a method of determining and reporting measurement quantities to find the "best emitting beam" (see paragraph [0002] of the application as published).

2. Added subject-matter (Article 123(2) EPC)

2.1 Feature e) of claim 1 as phrased in the former main request referred to a "value" without further limitation of this term and included the wording "and wherein the value is a value represented by bits". This was found to constitute added subject-matter in the decision under appeal.

2.2 In feature e) of claim 1 of the present main request, the term "value" has been limited to the expression "bit value" and the wording "and wherein the value is a value represented by bits" has been deleted.

Feature e) now corresponds literally to the wording of claim 2 as originally filed. The other features have a literal basis in claims 1, 5 to 7, 23, 25 and 28. Hence, present claim 1 no longer contains added subject-matter (Article 123(2) EPC).

3. Support by the description (Article 84 EPC)

3.1 The examining division referred to several passages of the present description as filed and found that the purpose of the invention was to "*accurately report/reflect measurement (quality) quantities while*

reducing the number of bits occupied by the SINR measurement quantities reported, thereby saving signalling overhead". According to the description as filed, this problem was addressed by reporting a "bit value" mapped to a measurement quantity or a difference of the measurement quantity to a specific one respectively, whereby the reported measurement quantity (difference) is based on ranges and occupies a certain (reduced) number of bits. Allegedly, this feature or concept was not clearly defined in the claims (appealed decision, Reason 12.2.1). Rather, the claims only mentioned a relationship between the values and the measurement quantities and their differences leaving the reader in doubt on how the reduction of the number of bits occupied by the reported measurement quantities was actually obtained.

3.2 The board is of a different view. The present description first mentions the problem of *how to measure the relevant information of different beams to reflect the transmission quality* (page 1, lines 17 to 19 and page 8, lines 3 to 7). A shortcoming in this respect is attributed to the use of the "reference signal receiving power RSRP" (page 7, line 27 to page 8, line 3). As a solution to that problem, using the signal-to-interference-plus-noise-ratio "SINR" is proposed (page 8, lines 8 to 28). This is, however, already included in claim 1.

3.3 Moreover, the present description mentions in several passages as a further aim saving signalling overhead (see page 16, lines 3 to 6; page 22, lines 2 and 3; page 24, lines 10 to 12 and page 27, lines 8 to 11). As a measure for addressing this aim, it is further disclosed to report, for a part *M* of the *K* signals, values corresponding to "measurement quantities" and to

report, for the remaining *K-M* signals, values corresponding to the differences between the measurement quantities and a measurement quantity (see e.g. page 17, lines 7 to 14 and 23 to 29; page 18, lines 12 to 22 and page 27, lines 12 to 15). It is noteworthy that the description at two instances only states that the measure "may" reduce signalling overhead, i.e. claiming only the *potential* to reduce the signalling overhead.

The cited passages, however, leave it open how the relationship between the "values" and the "measurement quantities" or their differences is defined even though the embodiment uses tables based on ranges. It is also apparent to a skilled person that there are *multiple* possibilities to define such a relationship and that the aforementioned concept of reporting, for *M* signals, values mapped to the "measurement quantities" and, for *K-M* signals, values mapped to differences of the measurement quantities is independent of how these mappings are defined in detail. It is also plausible that this concept has the potential to reduce the signalling overhead since differences of the measurement quantities may be reported with a lower resolution as the measurement quantities, as shown in the respective embodiments (see, for example, page 21, line 14 to page 22, line 3).

3.4 The board therefore considers that claim 1 is indeed supported by the description and does not lack any essential features (Article 84 EPC).

3.5 According to the appealed decision, the wording "bit value" was unclear because a "bit value" was known in the art as represented by "0" or "1" which rendered claim 1 unclear (cf. Reasons 2.4).

The board disagrees. A "bit" is the most basic digital data type and is, unlike the more specific data types such as "nibble", "byte" or "codeword", also understood as specifying the very basic type of a "value", namely that it includes one or more bits. Thus, a "bit value" would be understood by a skilled person simply as a *digital value* in particular when taking into account the present description as filed which uses the wording "bit value" for digital values with multiple bits (see e.g. page 10, lines 14 to 16: "*[...] a number of the bit values corresponding to the SINR is 128*").

4. The claimed subject-matter according to the present auxiliary request therefore complies with Articles 84 and 123(2) EPC.

5. Remittal (Article 111(1) EPC; Article 11 RPBA)

5.1 Given that the claimed subject-matter according to the present independent claims 1 and 2 now complies with Articles 84 and 123(2) EPC, the grounds for refusal are overcome.

5.2 However, this claim request has still to be examined for compliance with the other requirements of the EPC, in particular novelty and inventive step (Articles 54 and 56 EPC), which were not finally decided upon by the examining division.

5.3 Under the present circumstances, it would therefore not be prudent to take a final decision on e.g. novelty and inventive step for the first time in these appeal proceedings. The above considerations thus represent "special reasons" within the meaning of Article 11 RPBA for a remittal of the case.

5.4 In view of the above, the board has decided to remit the case to the examining division for further prosecution under Article 111(1) EPC, on the basis of the claims of the **main request** on file.

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

1. The decision under appeal is set aside.

2. The case is remitted to the examining division for further prosecution.

The Registrar: The Chair:

B. Brückner K. Bengi-Akyürek

Decision electronically authenticated