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# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

 The purpose of this document is to provide: an update on developments concerning the GENIE database; and an update on the work of, and proposals made by, the Working Group for the Development of a UPOV Denomination Similarity Search Tool (WG-DST) on the PLUTO database.

 The Administrative and Legal Committee (CAJ) is invited to:

(a) note the updates concerning the GENIE and PLUTO databases, as provided in paragraphs 6 to 16;

(b) consider whether to accept accents and special characters in denominations provided in the PLUTO database, noting that the denomination search tool on the PLUTO database would only use the character set ASCII [American Standard Code for Information Interchange] representation, as defined in ISO [International Standards Organization] Standard 646, as set out in paragraph 20;

(c) consider whether to revise the “Program for Improvements to the Plant Variety Database”, Section 3.1.3, as set out in paragraph 22, in order to change the acceptable character set to ISO/IEC Standard 8859 1: 1998;

(d) consider whether to expand the content of the PLUTO database to include all recognized varieties, including these that have not been, or were no longer, registered/protected as set out in paragraph 24; and

 (e) note that developments concerning non acceptable terms for variety denominations are reported in document CAJ/72/3 “Variety Denominations”.

 The following abbreviations are used in this document:

 CAJ: Administrative and Legal Committee

 TC: Technical Committee

 TWA: Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops

 TWC: Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs

 TWF: Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops

 TWO: Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees

 TWP(s): Technical Working Party(ies)

 TWV: Technical Working Party for Vegetables

 WG-DST Working Group for the Development of a UPOV Denomination Similarity Search Tool
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# PURPOSE

 The purpose of this document is to provide: an update on developments concerning the GENIE database; and an update on the work of and proposals made by, the Working Group for the Development of a UPOV Denomination Similarity Search Tool (WG-DST) on the PLUTO database.

# GENIE DATABASE

## Updates

 At its seventy-first session,[[1]](#footnote-2) the CAJ noted:

* the information on allocation of crop type(s) for UPOV codes currently used in the PLUTO database, as set out in document CAJ/71/5, paragraphs 10 and 11;[[2]](#footnote-3)
* that the information on crop type(s) would be introduced in the GENIE database and the GENIE database would be modified to show the crop type(s) for each UPOV Code by the end of March 2015;[[3]](#footnote-4)
* that a standard report for TWP allocations for UPOV codes would be introduced on the GENIE webpage by the end of March 2015;[[4]](#footnote-5)
* that allocation of crop type(s) for further UPOV codes would occur when UPOV codes were used in the PLUTO database for the first time;[[5]](#footnote-6) and
* that the Office of the Union would prepare tables of allocation of crop type(s) for UPOV codes used in the PLUTO database for the first time for checking by the relevant authorities, for each of the TWP sessions in 2015.[[6]](#footnote-7)

 The information on crop type(s) has been introduced in the GENIE database, which was modified
to show the crop type(s) for each UPOV Code.[[7]](#footnote-8) A standard report for TWP allocations for UPOV codes has also been introduced on the GENIE webpage.[[8]](#footnote-9)

 Crop type has only been allocated to the 3,412 UPOV codes currently used in the PLUTO database[[9]](#footnote-10). Allocation of crop type(s) for other UPOV codes will occur at the time that the UPOV codes are used in the PLUTO database for the first time. For each session of the TWPs in 2015, the Office of the Union prepared tables of allocation of crop type(s) for UPOV codes used in the PLUTO database for the first time, for checking by the relevant authorities.[[10]](#footnote-11)

# PLUTO DATABASE

## Updates

 At its seventy-first session, the CAJ:

* noted that an additional column in the PLUTO search screen, showing the date on which the information was provided, would be introduced by the end of March 2015;[[11]](#footnote-12) and
* agreed that both the fields “Denomination” and “Breeder’s Ref” be searchable, independently or in combination, by denomination search tools on the “Denomination Search” page of the PLUTO database, as set out in document CAJ/71/5, paragraphs 25 and 26.[[12]](#footnote-13)

 An additional column in the PLUTO search screen, showing the date on which the information was provided, has been introduced.

 A new function has been introduced to search both the data fields “Denomination” and “Breeder’s Ref”, individually or in combination, using the denomination search tools on the “Denomination Search” page of the PLUTO database.

## Training Course for contributions to the PLUTO database

 The second training course on “Contributing data to the PLUTO database” was held in Geneva, from September 7 to 9, 2015 in English. The aim of the course was to provide assistance to members of the Union that did not provide data for the PLUTO database, or did not provide data on a regular basis, in order to enable them to provide data for the PLUTO database on a regular basis.

 The training course was attended by the following participants from three members of the Union: Oman; South Africa; and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

 The participant from South Africa reported that it would provide data to PLUTO from December, 2015, after publication, four times a year.

 The participants from Oman and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia reported that they had not received applications and expressed their intention to submit data to PLUTO once applications were received.

 The third training course on “Contributing data to the PLUTO database” is planned to be held in Geneva, from October 12 to 14, 2015, in Spanish.

## Proposals from the WG-DST

 The background to this matter is provided in document CAJ/71/3 “Variety denominations”.

### Accents and special characters

 The WG-DST, at its second meeting,[[13]](#footnote-14) considered document UPOV/WG-DST/2/5 “Linguistic issues”.

 The WG-DST agreed that it would be useful to provide the possibility to accept accents and special characters in denominations in the PLUTO database. It noted that, although the PLUTO database did not currently contain accents and special characters,[[14]](#footnote-15), [[15]](#footnote-16) it would be possible for those elements to be included.[[16]](#footnote-17)

 In making the proposal to provide the possibility to accept accents and special characters in denominations in the PLUTO database, the WG-DST noted that the denomination search tool on the PLUTO database would, as now, only use the character set ASCII [American Standard Code for Information Interchange] representation, as defined in ISO [International Standards Organization] Standard 646.[[17]](#footnote-18)

 With regard to accents and special characters, a character set that contains the ASCII character set and a broad range of accents and special characters for the Latin alphabet is ISO / IEC [International Electrotechnical Commission] Standard 8859-1: 1998.

 On that basis, the CAJ may wish to consider the revision of the “Program for Improvements to the Plant Variety Database”, Section 3.1.3, as follows:

“3.1.3 Subject to Section 3.1.4, the character set for data shall be the ~~ASCII [American Standard Code for Information Interchange] representation, as defined in~~ ISO [International Standards Organization] / IEC [International Electrotechnical Commission] Standard 8859‑1: 1998[[18]](#footnote-19)~~646 Special characters, symbols or accents (˜, ˆ, ¨, º, etc.) are not accepted. Only characters of the English alphabet may be used.”~~

### Content of the PLUTO database

 The WG-DST, at its second meeting, considered document UPOV/WG-DST/2/2 “Revision of UPOV/INF/12 ‘Explanatory notes on variety denominations under the UPOV Convention’”.

 The WG-DST agreed to recommend that consideration be given to avoiding re-use of denominations in all cases. In this regard, the WG‑DST agreed to invite the CAJ to consider whether to expand the content of the PLUTO database to include all recognized varieties, including these that had not been, or were no longer, registered/protected.[[19]](#footnote-20)

 This matter will be considered further at the third meeting of the WG-DST, to be held in Geneva, on October 2, 2015. A report of the discussion at the third meeting of the WG-DST will be made to the CAJ, at its seventy-second session.

*Non-acceptable terms for variety denominations*

 The WG-DST agreed to invite the CAJ to consider whether to develop a list of non-acceptable terms for variety denominations as an additional feature for the UPOV denomination search tool. Developments on this matter are reported in document CAJ/72/3 “Variety Denominations”.[[20]](#footnote-21)

 The CAJ is invited to:

(a) note the updates concerning the GENIE and PLUTO databases, as provided in paragraphs 6 to 16 above;

(b) consider whether to accept accents and special characters in denominations provided in the PLUTO database, noting that the denomination search tool on the PLUTO database would only use the character set ASCII [American Standard Code for Information Interchange] representation, as defined in ISO [International Standards Organization] Standard 646, as set out in paragraph 20 above;

(c) consider whether to revise the “Program for Improvements to the Plant Variety Database”, Section 3.1.3, as set out in paragraph 22 above, in order to change the acceptable character set to ISO/IEC Standard 8859 1: 1998;

(d) consider whether to expand the content of the PLUTO database to include all recognized varieties, including these that have not been, or were no longer, registered/protected as set out in paragraph 24 above; and

 (e) note that developments concerning non‑acceptable terms for variety denominations are reported in document CAJ/72/3 “Variety Denominations”.

[End of document]
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“Foreword

“ISO (the International Organization for Standardization) and IEC (the International Electrotechnical Commission) form the specialized system for worldwide standardization.

“[…]

“Introduction

“ISO/IEC 8859 consists of several parts. Each part specifies a set of up to 191 graphic characters and the coded representation of these characters by means of a single 8-bit byte. Each set is intended for use for a particular group of languages.

“1 Scope

“This part of ISO/IEC 8859 specifies a set of 191 coded graphic characters identified as Latin alphabet No. 1.

“This set of coded graphic characters is intended for use in data and text processing applications and also for information interchange.

“The set contains graphic characters used for general purpose applications in typical office environments in at least the following languages:

“Albanian, Basque, Breton, Catalan, Danish, Dutch, English, Faroese, Finnish, French (with restrictions, see Annex A.1, Notes), Frisian, Galician, German, Greenlandic, Icelandic, Irish Gaelic (new orthography), Italian, Latin, Luxemburgish, Norwegian, Portuguese, Rhaeto‑Romanic, Scottish Gaelic, Spanish and Swedish. […]”. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
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