



UPOV/WG-DEN/1/4

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: March 11, 2016

## INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS

Geneva

### WORKING GROUP ON VARIETY DENOMINATION

**First Meeting  
Geneva, March 18, 2016**

#### EXPANSION OF THE CONTENT OF THE PLUTO DATABASE

*Document prepared by the Office of the Union*

*Disclaimer: this document does not represent UPOV policies or guidance*

#### PURPOSE

1. The purpose of this document is to present proposals concerning the content of the PLUTO database.

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Working Group on Variety Denomination (WG-DEN) is invited to consider:

(a) to accept accents and special characters in denominations in the PLUTO database while noting that the denomination search tool on the PLUTO database would only use the character set ASCII representation, as defined in ISO Standard 646;

(b) to revise the "Program for Improvements to the Plant Variety Database", Section 3.1.3 as set out in paragraph 12, in order to change the acceptable character set to ISO/IEC Standard 8859 1: 1998;

(c) to invite members of the Union to check whether they have relevant variety data that is no longer included in the PLUTO database but was submitted to the PLUTO database previously;

(d) to introduce a unique identifier for variety records in the PLUTO database in order that new data submissions would add to the existing data rather than replacing it;

(e) whether additional data should be included in PLUTO or accessible via a search platform for independent databases; and

(f) to invite members of the Union to propose data that they would wish to include in the PLUTO database or accessible via a search platform for independent databases.

3. 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

4. The structure of this document is as follows:

PURPOSE .....	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
ACCENTS AND SPECIAL CHARACTERS IN DENOMINATION IN THE PLUTO DATABASE.....	2
Background .....	2
Developments at the WG-DST .....	2
Developments at the CAJ.....	2
Proposal .....	3
POSSIBLE EXPANSION OF THE CONTENT OF THE PLUTO DATABASE .....	3
Developments at the WG-DST .....	3
Developments at the CAJ.....	4
Proposals .....	4

## ACCENTS AND SPECIAL CHARACTERS IN DENOMINATIONS IN THE PLUTO DATABASE

### Background

5. Document CAJ/69/6 “Information Databases”, Annex I “Program for Improvements to the Plant Variety Database”, Section 3.1.3 states 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] Standard 646. Special characters, symbols or accents (˜, ^, ¨, °, etc.) are not accepted. Only characters of the English alphabet may be used.”

### Developments at the WG-DST

6. The Working Group for the Development of a UPOV Denomination Similarity Search Tool (WG-DST), at its second meeting, held in Geneva on June 9, 2015, considered document UPOV/WG-DST/2/5 “Linguistic issues”.

7. 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, it would be possible for those elements to be included (see document UPOV/WG-DST/2/6 “Report”, paragraphs 17 and 18).

8. 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 for searching denominations, as defined in ISO [International Standards Organization] Standard 646 (see document UPOV/WG-DST/2/6 “Report”, paragraph 19).

### Developments at the CAJ

9. The CAJ, at its seventy-second session, held in Geneva, on October 26 and 27, considered document CAJ/72/6 “UPOV Information Databases” which contained the following proposed amendment to the Program for Improvements to the Plant Variety Database:

“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 ~~646 Special characters, symbols or accents (˜, ^, ¨, °, etc.) are not accepted. Only characters of the English alphabet may be used.~~”

10. The CAJ noted the proposal to accept accents and special characters in denominations provided in the PLUTO database, while noting that the denomination search tool on the PLUTO database would only use the character set ASCII representation, as defined in ISO Standard 646. The CAJ agreed that the

matter should be referred to the WG-DEN (see document CAJ/72/9 "Report on the Conclusions", paragraph 39).

### Proposal

11. 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 as follows (see [http://www.iso.org/iso/home/store/catalogue\\_tc/catalogue\\_detail.htm?csnumber=28245](http://www.iso.org/iso/home/store/catalogue_tc/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=28245)):

"ISO/IEC 8859 – 1: 1998 'Information technology -- 8-bit single-byte coded graphic character sets -- Part 1: Latin alphabet No. 1'.

"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. [...]"

12. The WG-DEN is invited to consider the proposal to revise 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 646 Special characters, symbols or accents (~, ^, ", °, etc.) are not accepted. Only characters of the English alphabet may be used."~~

## POSSIBLE EXPANSION OF THE CONTENT OF THE PLUTO DATABASE

### Developments at the WG-DST

13. 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'".

14. 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 (see document UPOV/WG-DST/2/6 "Report", paragraph 30).

15. The WG-DST, at its third meeting, held in Geneva, on October 2, 2015, considered document UPOV/WG-DST/3/4 "Content of the PLUTO Database".

16. The WG-DST agreed that the PLUTO database should contain only data on varieties which satisfy the UPOV definition of variety and for which the source is appropriate.

*Variety data no longer included in the PLUTO database (historical data)*

17. The WG-DST, at its third meeting, agreed subject to the views of the CAJ, to invite members of the Union to check whether they have relevant variety data that is no longer included in the PLUTO database but was submitted to the PLUTO database previously (see document UPOV/WG-DST/3/6 "Report", paragraph 19).

18. The WG-DST agreed that it would be useful to introduce a unique identifier for variety records in the PLUTO database in order that new data submissions would add to the existing data rather than replacing it. In that regard, the WG-DST agreed to invite the CAJ to consider the possible introduction of a unique identifier for the PLUTO database previously (see document UPOV/WG-DST/3/6 "Report", paragraph 20).

*Other varieties (new data)*

19. The WG-DST, at its third meeting, noted that there could be relevant data for variety denomination purposes but for which the source was not appropriate for the data to be included in the PLUTO database (see document UPOV/WG-DST/3/6 "Report", paragraph 21).

20. The WG-DST also noted that it would be useful to further consider the development of a common search platform<sup>1</sup> that would search multiple databases containing variety denominations. The WG-DST noted that such an approach might not be as efficient as including all data in the same database (see document UPOV/WG-DST/3/6 "Report", paragraph 22).

21. The WG-DST, at its third meeting, agreed, subject to the views of the CAJ, to consider whether additional data should be included in PLUTO or accessible via a search platform for independent databases and agreed that it might be appropriate to invite members of the Union to propose data that they would wish to include (see document UPOV/WG-DST/3/6 "Report", paragraph 23).

Developments at the CAJ

22. The CAJ, at its seventy-second session, agreed that matters concerning the possible expansion of 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 document CAJ/72/6, paragraph 24, be referred to the WG-DEN (see document CAJ/72/9 "Report on the Conclusions", paragraph 40).

Proposals

23. On the above basis, the proposals to be considered by the WG-DEN are as follows:

(a) to invite members of the Union to check whether they have relevant variety data that is no longer included in the PLUTO database but was submitted to the PLUTO database previously;

(b) to introduce a unique identifier for variety records in the PLUTO database in order that new data submissions would add to the existing data rather than replacing it;

(c) whether additional data should be included in PLUTO or accessible via a search platform for independent databases; and

(d) to invite members of the Union to propose data that they would wish to include in the PLUTO database.

---

<sup>1</sup> See document CAJ/69/6 "UPOV information Databases", Annex I "Program for Improvements to the Plant Variety Database", section 6 "Common search platform"

24. *The WG-DEN is invited to consider:*

*(a) to accept accents and special characters in denominations in the PLUTO database while noting that the denomination search tool on the PLUTO database would only use the character set ASCII representation, as defined in ISO Standard 646;*

*(b) to revise the “Program for Improvements to the Plant Variety Database”, Section 3.1.3 as set out in paragraph 12 above, in order to change the acceptable character set to ISO/IEC Standard 8859 1: 1998;*

*(c) to invite members of the Union to check whether they have relevant variety data that is no longer included in the PLUTO database but was submitted to the PLUTO database previously;*

*(d) to introduce a unique identifier for variety records in the PLUTO database in order that new data submissions would add to the existing data rather than replacing it;*

*(e) whether additional data should be included in PLUTO or accessible via a search platform for independent databases; and*

*(f) to invite members of the Union to propose data that they would wish to include in the PLUTO database or accessible via a search platform for independent databases.*

[End of document]