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# Executive summary

The purpose of this document is to present proposals on the “Genera and Species Database” (GENIE database), including UPOV codes for *Citrus*, and proposals for improvements to the UPOV Plant Variety Database (PLUTO database).

How to identify UPOV members with practical experience for cooperation in DUS examination

This document presents a proposal to revise the GENIE database to facilitate identifying UPOV members with experience in the examination of distinctness, uniformity and stability (DUS) of particular crops.

The Technical Committee (TC), at its sixtieth session[[1]](#footnote-2), agreed that members sought cooperation in DUS examination directly with authorities with experience in examination of the crops of their interest. The TC agreed that information in the GENIE database and in the Council document “Cooperation in Examination” was outdated and could possibly be discontinued.

Discontinuing the “Cooperation in DUS Examination” part of the GENIE Database would not affect the provision of information on “Practical experience in DUS examination”, which would continue to be collected and searchable online in the GENIE database, as well as in printable format in the TC document “List of genera and species for which authorities have practical experience in the examination of DUS”. At their sessions in 2025, the Technical Working Parties (TWPs) agreed with this proposal.

The Council is invited to discontinue the section on “Cooperation in examination” [agreements] in the GENIE database and the Council document “Cooperation in Examination”. The proposal would consolidate searches for cooperation into a single procedure in the GENIE database using information provided under “Practical experience in DUS examination” and the Technical Committee document “List of genera and species for which authorities have practical experience in the examination of distinctness, uniformity and stability.”

UPOV Codes: Reclassification of *Citrus*, ×*Citroncirus, Fortunella* and *Poncirus* taxa

This document presents a proposal to revise UPOV codes for genera and species of the *Citrus* complex no longer recognized as valid botanical names, including the several *Citrus* species and the genera ×*Citroncirus, Fortunella* and *Poncirus*.

The Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops (TWF), at its session in 2025, considered the UPOV codes affected by the reclassification and agreed to invite Spain to lead discussions on this matter. A proposal to revise the UPOV codes for the genera ×*Citroncirus, Fortunella* and *Poncirus* is presented in Annex I to this document.

PLUTO Database

The need to improve the completeness and timeliness of data submitted to PLUTO has been identified. In order to address this matter, it is essential to understand the reasons and factors limiting data contributions. The UPOV Office will carry out a survey among UPOV members in 2025 to that end.

Another survey will be carried out in 2026 among PLUTO users and other potential user groups to gain further insights into the data, efficiency and user-friendliness of the search functionality of PLUTO.

A roadmap setting out the work that is planned to be carried out in 2026-2027 to develop PLUTO and improve the completeness and timeliness of contributions can be found at the end of this document.
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The following abbreviations are used in this document:

CAJ: Administrative and Legal Committee

TC: Technical Committee

TWA: Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops

TWF: Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops

TWM: Technical Working Party for Testing Methods and Techniques

TWO: Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees

TWP(s): Technical Working Party(ies)

TWV: Technical Working Party for Vegetables

# GENIE database: finding cooperation in DUS examination

## Background

The TC, at its sixtieth session[[2]](#footnote-3), agreed that members sought cooperation in DUS examination directly with authorities with experience in examination of the crops of their interest. The TC agreed that information in the GENIE database and the Council document “Cooperation in Examination” was outdated and could possibly be discontinued.

At their sessions in 2025, the TWO, TWV, TWA and TWF agreed[[3]](#footnote-4) with the proposal to discontinue the section on “Cooperation in DUS Examination” in the GENIE database. The TWO, TWV, TWA and TWF noted that information on “Practical experience in DUS examination” would continue to be collected and provided in the GENIE database and the TC document “List of genera and species for which authorities have practical experience in the examination of distinctness, uniformity and stability.”

The following section provides the rationale to discontinue the section “Cooperation in DUS Examination” in the GENIE Database and to consolidate information on “Practical experience in DUS examination”. Discontinuing the section on “Cooperation in DUS Examination” would include discontinuing the provision of data on cooperation agreements for DUS examination on behalf of other UPOV members; and declarations of use of DUS test reports provided by other UPOV members.

## Data collection and publication

UPOV members are invited annually to provide information on “Cooperation in DUS examination” and “Practical experience in DUS examination”. The information compiled is presented in Council document C/[XX]/5 “Cooperation in Examination”. The document provides “general notes” and a list of genera and species with the authorities that report their availability to carry out examination on behalf, or utilize DUS reports provided by, other authorities. The same information provided in the Council document is available online in the GENIE database:

Since 2019, a total of 38 members have provided information on cooperation in DUS examination. The largest number of contributions was received in 2024, with 14 members providing information.

Discontinuing the “Cooperation in Examination” part of the GENIE database would not affect the other part of the database dealing with “Practical experience in DUS examination”.

## Identifying UPOV members with experience in DUS examination of different crops

UPOV members usually seek cooperation in DUS examination directly with authorities having experience in examination of crops of their interest. Information on which authority has experience in examination is provided in the GENIE database for any particular crop under “Practical experience in DUS examination”. When identifying the authorities having experience in examination of a certain crop, information on the cooperation in examination between authorities is of very limited relevance.

### GENIE Database: Practical experience in DUS examination

Contact persons of members of the Union at the TC are invited every year to update the list of genera and species for which they have practical experience in DUS examination. The information is compiled in TC document TC/[XX]/4 “List of genera and species for which authorities have practical experience in DUS examination”. The document provides information as a list of genera and species with the respective authorities that declare having experience examining the crop. The same information provided in the TC document is available online in the GENIE database.

Since 2019, a total of 28 members have provided information on practical experience in DUS examination. The largest number of contributions was received in 2024, with 14 members providing information.

### PLUTO database

The TC, at its sixtieth session[[4]](#footnote-5), considered how UPOV members can search for information on experience in DUS examination and noted that the PLUTO database was commonly used by members.

Experience in DUS examination may be derived from the PLUTO database by searching for UPOV members receiving applications and granting titles for the different genera and species. Searches can be conducted for a defined period of time, identifying UPOV members with recent experience handling applications for particular crops.

The TC considered options to identify the authority that had conducted the technical examination of a variety and agreed that this information was required in the UPOV Model Form for the Application for Plant Breeders’ Rights (document TGP/5, Section 2).

### UPOV e‑PVP DUS Report Exchange Platform

The UPOV e‑PVP DUS Report Exchange Platform enables users to commission DUS examination and exchange existing test reports. Information on the authorities offering DUS test reports can be derived directly from the UPOV e‑PVP DUS Report Exchange Platform. A report on developments will be provided to the TWPs, at their sessions in 2026.

The TC, at its sixtieth session4, noted that the UPOV e‑PVP DUS Report Exchange Platform provided information on test reports available for exchange and offered to conduct DUS examination on behalf of other authorities.

## Proposal

The Council may wish to consider discontinuing the section on “Cooperation in DUS Examination” in the GENIE database (e.g. cooperation agreements for DUS examination on behalf of other UPOV members; and declarations on the use of DUS test reports provided by other UPOV members).

Discontinuing the section on “Cooperation in DUS Examination” would not affect the section “Practical experience in DUS examination” of the GENIE database, nor the publication of document “List of genera and species for which authorities have practical experience in the examination of DUS” (see document [TC/61/4](https://www.upov.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?meeting_id=85861&doc_id=649839)).

The Council is invited to consider discontinuing the section on “Cooperation in DUS Examination” in the GENIE database and the Council document with the same title, with the understanding that such a decision would not affect the section “Practical experience in DUS examination” of the GENIE database, nor the publication of document “List of genera and species for which authorities have practical experience in the examination of DUS”, as set out in paragraphs 13 to 28 of this document.

# genera and species database (GENIE database)

The Genera and Species database (GENIE database – available at: <http://www.upov.int/genie/en/>) has been developed to provide online information on the status of protection, cooperation in examination, experience in DUS testing and existence of UPOV Test Guidelines for different GENera and specIEs (hence GENIE). The GENIE database is used to generate the relevant Council and TC documents concerning that information[[5]](#footnote-6).

The GENIE database is the repository of the UPOV codes and provides information concerning the principal and alternative botanical names and common names of plant taxa.

In 2024, 505 new UPOV codes were created. The total number of UPOV codes in the GENIE database as of December 31, 2024, was 10,109.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| New UPOV codes | 577 | 188 | 173 | 440 | 242 | 243 | 177 | 131 | 183 | 78 | 505 |
| Total UPOV Codes | 7,808 | 7,992 | 8,149 | 8,589 | 8,844 | 9,077 | 9,213 | 9,342 | 9,525 | 9,605 | 10,109 |

# UPOV codes for Citrus

## Background

The TC, at its fifty-seventh session[[6]](#footnote-7), agreed to amend the UPOV code CITRU\_AUM, following the reclassification of *Citrus clementina* hort. ex Tanaka (UPOV code: CITRU\_CLE) as a synonym of *Citrus aurantium* L. (UPOV code: CITRU\_AUM), as provided below. This reclassification merged under the same botanical name different species from the group “oranges” (TG/202) and group “mandarins” (TG/201), which have separate Test Guidelines. The TC agreed to append information to the UPOV code CITRU\_AUM to enable data contributors to indicate when a variety belonged to group “1MA” for mandarins; and “2OR” for oranges.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Old | | | | | New | | |
| Entries in PLUTO | TG | UPOV Code | Principal botanical name | Other botanical name(s) | UPOV Code | Principal botanical name | Other botanical name(s) |
| 10 | TG/202 | CITRU\_AUM | *Citrus aurantium* L. | n.a. | CITRU\_AUM**\_1MA**  CITRU\_AUM**\_2OR** | Citrus ×*aurantium* L. | *Citrus* *amara* Link;  *Citrus* *bigarradia* Loisel.;  *Citrus* *intermedia* hort. ex Tanaka;  *Citrus* *taitensis* Risso;  *Citrus* *vulgaris* Risso;  *Citrus* ×*aurantium* subsp. *aurantium* L.;  *Citrus* ×*aurantium* subsp. *jambiri* Engl.;  *Citrus* ×*aurantium* subsp. *keonla* Engl.;  *Citrus* ×*aurantium* subsp. *suntara* Engl.;  *Citrus* ×*aurantium* var. *aurantium* L.;  *Citrus* ×*aurantium* var. *citrina* Lush.;  *Citrus* ×*bigarradia* var. *volkameriana* Risso;  *Citrus* ×*clementina* hort. ex Tanaka;  *Citrus* ×*crenatifolia* Lush.;  *Citrus* *reticulata* × *C*. *maxima* |
| 115 | TG/201 | CITRU\_CLE | *Citrus clementina* hort. ex Tanaka | n.a. |
| 1 | / | CITRU\_MRE | *Citrus maxima* X *Citrus reticulata* | n.a. |
| 0 | TG/201 | CITRU\_CRE | *Citrus crenatifolia* Lush. | n.a. |
| 0 | TG/204 | CITRU\_INT | *Citrus intermedia* hort. ex Tanaka | n.a. |

As consequential changes, the TC agreed that the UPOV codes CITRU\_CLE, CITRU\_MRE, CITRU\_CRE, CITRU\_INT, CITRU\_AUR, CITRU\_DAV, CITRU\_EXC, CITRU\_KER, CITRU\_BAL, CITRU\_KAR and CITRU\_BEN should be deleted. The TC agreed with the proposal from the TWF for partial revision of the Test Guidelines for *Citrus* to move obsolete species from the “principle botanical names” box to the “alternative botanical names” box.

The TC, at its sixtieth session[[7]](#footnote-8), noted the reclassification of genera and species of the *Citrus* complex which are no longer recognized as valid botanical names, including the genera ×*Citroncirus*, *Fortunella* and *Poncirus*. The TC agreed to submit to the TWF a proposal for amending the UPOV codes for *Citrus* and related genera and species, as provided in Annex I to this document.

## Proposals for amendments to UPOV codes for *Citrus*

The TWF, at its fifty sixth session[[8]](#footnote-9), considered the proposals for amending the UPOV codes for *Citrus* and related genera and species, as provided in Annex I to this document.

The TWF agreed to invite experts to provide comments on the proposed amendments, to be submitted to the Office of the Union by July 24, 2025. The TWF agreed that UPOV codes receiving comments would be considered by the TWF, at its session in 2026; and the remaining UPOV Codes would be proposed to the Technical Committee to be amended.

Following the fifty-sixth session of the TWF, the UPOV Office received comments on a number of UPOV codes that would require further discussion on the latest taxonomical information.

As a result of the process agreed by the TWF, Annex I to this document presents a proposal to amend the UPOV codes for the genera ×*Citroncirus*, *Fortunella* and *Poncirus*. Members of the Union and contributors of data to the PLUTO database would be informed in advance by means of a circular of any deletions and the date in 2026 when these would be implemented. Contributors of data to the PLUTO database would be requested to use the updated UPOV codes when submitting their plant variety data to the Office of the Union.

The TC is invited to consider a proposal to amend the UPOV codes for the genera ×Citroncirus, Fortunella and Poncirus, as set out in Annex I to this document.

### Revision of common names associated with UPOV codes for Citrus

The TWF agreed that the common names for some UPOV codes for *Citrus* should be revised. The TWF agreed to invite Spain to lead the revision of the common names associated with the UPOV codes for *Citrus*, in collaboration with Australia, Canada, China, European Union, Japan, Morocco, New Zealand, Republic of Korea and CIOPORA.

### Revision of scope of the five Test Guidelines for Citrus groups

The TWF agreed that the revision of UPOV codes provided the opportunity to redefine the scope of the five Test Guidelines for *Citrus* groups (documents TG/83, TG/201, TG/202, TG/203 and TG/204).

The TWF noted the proposal from Spain “To provide a structured classification of *Citrus* varieties adapted to official registration [plant variety protection/national listing], integrating the most current and scientifically rigorous classification proposal with practical and commercial use.”

The TWF agreed that the outcome of the work led by Spain would provide the basis for the revision of scope of the five Test Guidelines for *Citrus* and confirming the common names associated with the respective UPOV codes for consideration by the TWF, at its session in 2026.

The TC is invited to note developments on the revision of common names associated with UPOV codes for Citrus and the revision of scope of the five Test Guidelines for Citrus groups, as set out in paragraphs 41 to 44 of this document.

# PLUTO database

## Current Use and Access

The number and different types of users of the PLUTO database from 2021 to 2025 are indicated in the table below:

| Type of users | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Paying *premium* users | 9 | 21 | 52 | 8 | 15 |
| Non-paying *premium* users (Eligible Officials) | 97 | 136 | 149 | 151 | 158 |
| PVP contributors | 28 | 43 | 59 | 61 | 62 |
| Other users (standard service) | 1,131 | 2,704 | 4,370 | 4,855 | 6,486 |

\*as of August 2025.

A report on data contributed to PLUTO by members of the Union and other contributors is provided in Annex II to this document.

Since the sessions of the TC and CAJ in 2024, the Office of the Union arranged initial online sessions with the following new contributors to outline the contribution process and familiarize them with the PLUTO database interface for contributors:

* Brazil (National Listing)
* Oman
* Türkiye

During the October sessions in 2024, the Office of the Union offered service helpdesk sessions to assist in the process of providing data to the PLUTO database. Assistance was provided to delegates from Albania, China, Republic of Korea and Uruguay. The same type of service helpdesk assistance will be provided at the fringes of the UPOV sessions in October 2025.

## Data contribution

PLUTO contributors should aim to submit data as frequently as possible, ideally right after its publication. The percentage of PVP applications of UPOV members included in the PLUTO database within one year was 40% in 2024. It is anticipated that there will be an increase of the 2024 figures due to expected contributions in 2025. Contributions from UPOV members continue to vary in frequency, having an impact on data timeliness. Consequently, this has an impact on the completeness of data provided to users for searching, reducing the efficiency of the tool as the search results may exclude records from non‑contributing authorities.

### Challenges faced by data contributors

To improve the completeness and timeliness of contributions to the PLUTO database, it is essential to understand the reasons behind limited contributions.

Through direct engagement and feedback, the Office of the Union identified the challenges listed below as key factors making the data contribution difficult, particularly for new data contributors:

(a) data submission template is complex;

(b) improper data field mapping may result in inaccurate data being loaded into the system; and

(c) compliance report generated after data submission is insufficiently informative to guide necessary corrections.

In addition, the update of UPOV codes (including deletions and replacements) is not done automatically for the old data.

### Future plans

To understand additional factors affecting the completeness and timeliness of data contributions, a survey will be distributed to UPOV members in 2025.

To address the identified challenges in data contribution, the following goals are proposed:

(a) encourage increased participation: aim to increase the percentage of PVP applications of UPOV members included in PLUTO database within one year to 60% in 2027 (see document C/59/4 “Draft Program and Budget for the 2026-2027 Biennium”);

(b) improve the data submission experience:

(i) data preparation: in consultation with each new contributing UPOV member, the UPOV office will create a customized guideline that defines the meaning and data constraints of each PLUTO data field corresponding to that UPOV member. This process involves reviewing the UPOV member’s data structure to support consistency and usability of PLUTO data;

(ii) data validation: develop and provide a data quality checking tool that enables the identification and correction of data quality issues, including verifying mandatory fields for each record status, ensuring denomination statuses are paired with corresponding dates, and standardizing date formats;

(iii) data submission: keep the Text format (SGML-Standard Generalized Markup Language) for existing contributors and make other ways to contribute data available:

* + - using machine to machine: API;
    - improving excel templates;
    - using UPOV e‑PVP Administration Module.

The UPOV Office will explore ways to develop a data quality checking tool in cooperation with the Community Plant Variety Office of the European Union (CPVO) to enhance efficiency of data provision to the PLUTO database.

## PLUTO Search

### Challenges faced by the users

Feedback indicates that new search functions are required by PLUTO search users:

(a) search by multiple UPOV codes or crop group;

(b) search by different parties at the same time: for example, it is not possible to search for all varieties where the breeder is BREEDER X and the Agent is AGENT Y;

(c) ignore case-sensitiveness of the search criteria;

(d) filter by all the fields;

(e) have an aggregated view of the results by authority, crop group, year.

To gain further insights into the efficiency and user-friendliness of the search functionality, a survey will be distributed to all PLUTO users as well as other potential user groups, such as UPOV PRISMA users, distance learning students, and breeders’ associations.

In 2024, the number of paying *premium* users was eight (8). To attract more paying *premium* users, it is necessary to identify the challenges and to address them to make the tool more attractive.

### Future plans

In order to improve the user experience, the following actions are proposed:

(a) address the limitations raised in paragraph 57;

(b) enhanced synonym recognition for species and denominations;

(c) better handling of non-Roman characters and multilingual data; and

(d) clearer explanations for users on what fields are being searched.

The current denomination search functionality in the PLUTO database could be improved in identifying similar or confusing variety denominations. AI-based tools for natural language and pattern recognition could significantly improve these capabilities. Depending on available resources, the use of such AI tools may be explored.

## Roadmap

At its seventy-sixth session[[9]](#footnote-10), the CAJ agreed on the Program for Improvements to the PLUTO database as provided in document CAJ/76/7 “UPOV information databases”, including the provision of assistance to members, data format and frequency of data contribution. It is proposed to report on what was achieved and reconsider this program, especially sections 3 and 6, at the eighty-third session of the CAJ to be held in 2026 to reflect the future plans.

The following roadmap outlines proposed actions in 2026-2027:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Timeframe | Activity |
| Quarter 4, 2025 | Launch contributor survey |
| Quarter 1, 2026 | Launch user survey |
| Quarters 1 to 3, 2026 | Identify the requirements and propose a plan for improvements |
| October 2026 | Report progress to the CAJ and TC; propose a new version of the Program for Improvements to the PLUTO database for adoption by the CAJ at its eighty‑third session in 2026 |
| Quarter 4, 2026 to quarter 3, 2027 | Implement the agreed improvements |
| Quarter 4, 2027 | Aim for 60% as the percentage of PVP applications of UPOV members included in PLUTO database within one year and measurable data quality improvements |

The CAJ is invited to:

(a) note the current use of PLUTO and the challenges faced by data contributors and other users;

(b) consider conducting two surveys:

(i) a survey to UPOV members to understand additional factors affecting the completeness and timeliness of data contributions;

(ii) a survey to all users, and future users, to gain insights into the data, efficiency and user-friendliness of the search functionality; and

(c) consider the roadmap presented in paragraph 63.

[Annexes follow]

ANNEX I  
  
PROPOSAL FOR AMENDING THE UPOV CODES FOR CITRUS AND RELATED GENERA AND SPECIES

| Entries in PLUTO | UPOV TG | Current |  | Proposal for Amendment | | | Common Name  EN | Common Name  FR | Common Name  DE | Common Name  ES |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UPOV code |  | New or Integrated UPOV code | Valid botanical name | Other botanical name(s) |
| 1 |  | [CITFO](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=1329) |  | CITRU | *Citrus* L. | ×*Citrofortunella* J. W. Ingram & H. E. Moore; *Citrus* L. × *Fortunella* Swingle | orange, mandarin, lemon, pummelo, grapefruit, non-kumquat citrus × kumquat |  |  |  |
| 16 |  | FORTU |  | kumquat | kumquat | Kumquat; Zwergorangen; Zwergpomeranzen | kumquat; naranjo enano; naranjo chino |
| 1 |  | PONCI |  | trifoliate orange; Japanese bitter orange; Chinese bitter orange; hardy orange | oranger trifolié; citronnier épineux | Dreiblättrige Orange; Dreiblättrige Bitterorange; Bitterorange; Bitterzitrone | naranjo trifoliado; naranjo espinoso; naranjo trébol |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | [TG/83](https://www.upov.int/edocs/tgdocs/en/tg083.pdf) | [CITRO\_NTR](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=9251) |  | CITRU\_ATR | Hybrids between *Citrus* ×*aurantium* L. × *Citrus trifoliata* L. | Hybrids between *Citrus nobilis* Lour. × *Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf.; Hybrids between *Citrus ×aurantium* L. var. *chrysocarpa* (Hassk.) ined. × *Citrus trifoliata* L.; *Citrus aurantium* L. × *Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf; Hybrids between *Citrus ×aurantium* L. var. *racemosa* (Risso) ined. and *Citrus trifoliata* L.; *Citrus reshni* hort. ex Tanaka × *Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf.; *Citrus sunki* (Hayata) hort. ex Tanaka × *Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf.; *Citrus reticulata* Blanco var. *austera* Swingle × *Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf.; *Citrus nobilis* Lour. var. *sunki* Hayata × *Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf.; *Citrus ×paradisi* Macfad. × *Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf.; *Citrus ×clementina* hort. ex Tanaka × *Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf.; *Citrus sunki* (Hayata) hort. ex Tanaka × *Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf.; *Citrus reticulata* Blanco var. *austera* Swingle × *Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf.; *Citrus nobilis* Lour. var. *sunki* Hayata × *Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf. | 'King' mandarin × trifoliate orange; citrandarin | mandarinier King × oranger trifolié; citrandarin | Mandarine 'King' × Dreiblättrige Orange; Citrandarin | mandarino 'King' × naranjo trifoliado; citrandarin |
| 0 |  | [CITRO\_ATR](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=1322) |  | citradia | citradia | Citradia | citradia |
| 8 |  | [CITRO\_PTR](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=1326) |  | citrumelo | citrumelo | Citrumelo | citrumelo |
| 32 |  | [CITRO\_CTR](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=7789) |  | citrentin  'Sunki' sour mandarin × trifoliate orange; 'Sunkat' sour mandarin × trifoliate orange | citrentin | Citrentin | citrentin |
| 0 |  | [CITRO\_STR](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=9252) |  | mandarinier Sunki × oranger trifolié | Mandarine 'Sunki' × Dreiblättrige Orange | mandarino 'Sunki' × naranjo trifoliado |
|  |  | [CITRO\_HTR](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=1323) |  | 'Cleopatra' sour mandarin × trifoliate orange; 'Sunki' sour mandarin × trifoliate orange; 'Billi Kichili' sour mandarin × trifoliate orange; 'Sunkat' sour mandarin × trifoliate orange | mandarinier Cleopatra × oranger trifolié; mandarinier Sunki × oranger trifolié | Mandarine 'Cleopatra' × Dreiblättrige Orange; Mandarine 'Sunki' × Dreiblättrige Orange | mandarino 'Cleopatra' × naranjo trifoliado; mandarino 'Sunki' × naranjo trifoliado |
| 0 | [TG/201](https://www.upov.int/edocs/tgdocs/en/tg201.pdf) | [FORTU\_HIN](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=7263) |  | CITRU\_HIN | *Citrus hindsii* (Champ. ex Benth.) Govaerts | *Fortunella hindsii* (Champ. ex Benth.) Swingle | Hong Kong kumquat; 'Jindou' kumquat; Hongkong kumquat; golden bean kumquat | kumquat de Hong Kong; kumquat sauvage | Hongkong-Kumquat; Chinesische Kumquat; Wilder Kumquat | kumquat de Hong Kong |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | [CITRO\_HTS](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=1324) |  | CITRU\_HTS | (*Citrus ×aurantium* L. var. *chrysocarpa*(Hassk.) ined. × *Citrus trifoliata* L.) × *Citrus ×aurantium* L. var. *sinensis*L. | *(Citrus reshni* hort. ex Tanaka × *Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf.) *× Citrus sinensis* (L.) Osbeck | ('Cleopatra' sour mandarin × trifoliate orange) × sweet orange | (mandarinier Cleopatra × oranger trifolié) × oranger douce | (Mandarine 'Cleopatra' × Dreiblättrige Orange)' × Süße Orange | (mandarino 'Cleopatra' × naranjo trifoliado) × naranjo dulce |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | [FOPON](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=7798) |  | CITRU\_HYB | *Citrus* hybr. | *Fortunella* sp. × *Poncirus* sp.; *Fortunella × obovata* hort. ex Tanaka; ×*Citroncirus* hybr. ; *Fortunella* sp. × *Poncirus* sp.; *Citrus × Citrus trifoliata* L. | citrumquat | citrumquat | none | none |
| 0 |  | [FORTU\_OBO](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=7267) |  | 'Changshou' kumquat; 'Fukushu' kumquat; 'Jiangsu' kumquat | kumquat du Changshou; kumquat de Fukushu | 'Changshou'-Kumquat | kumquat 'Changshou' |
| 2 |  | [CITRO\_HYB](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=9553) |  | citrus hybrid | none | none | none |
| 0 |  | [FOPON\_TRI](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=9042) |  | citrumquat | citrumquat | none | none |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | [TG/83](https://www.upov.int/edocs/tgdocs/en/tg083.pdf) | [CITRO](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=1321) |  | CITRU\_INS | *Citrus* ×*insitorum* Mabb. | *Citrus × Poncirus;* ×*Citroncirus* J. W. Ingram & H. E. Moore; ×*Citroncirus webberi* J. W. Ingram & H. E. Moore; *Citrus sinensis* × *Poncirus trifoliata* | citrange | citrange | Citrange | citrange |
| 21 |  | [CITRO\_WEB](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=1328) |  | citrange | citrange | Citrange | citrange |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | [TG/201](https://www.upov.int/edocs/tgdocs/en/tg201.pdf) | [FORTU\_CRA](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=7266) |  | CITRU\_JAP | *Citrus japonica* Thunb. | *Fortunella japonica* (Thunb.) Swingle; *Fortunella crassifolia* Swingle; Fortunella margarita (Lour.) Swingle | large round kumquat; ’Meiwa’ kumquat; 'Jindan' kumquat; 'Neiha' kumquat | kumquat Meiwa | Meiwa-Kumquat | kumquat ‘Meiwa’ |
| 0 | [TG/201](https://www.upov.int/edocs/tgdocs/en/tg201.pdf) | [FORTU\_JAP](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=7264) |  | ‘Marumi’ kumquat; round kumquat; 'Luowen' kumquat; round cumquat | kumquat Marumi; kumquat rond; kumquat du Japon | Marumi-Kumquat; Runde Kumquat; Marumikumquat | kumquat redondo; naranjita japonesa |
| 2 | [TG/201](https://www.upov.int/edocs/tgdocs/en/tg201.pdf) | [FORTU\_MAR](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=2389) |  | ‘Nagami’ kumquat; oval kumquat; 'Luofu' kumquat; oval cumquat | kumquat Nagami; kumquat ovale; kumquat à fruits oblongs | Ovale Kumquat; Ovalkumquat | kumquat ‘Nagami’ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | [CITRO\_JTR](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=1325) |  | CITRU\_JTR | *Citrus ×otaitensis* (Risso & Poit.) Risso × *Citrus trifoliata* L. | *Citrus jambhiri* Lush. × *Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf. | rough lemon × trifoliate orange | rough lemon × oranger trifolié | Jambhiri-Zitronen × Dreiblättrige Orange | limonero rugoso × naranjo trifoliado |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  | [CITRO\_LTR](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=7337) |  | CITRU\_LTR | Hybrids between *Citrus latipes*(Swingle) Tanaka × *Citrus trifoliata* L. | *Citrus latipes* (Swingle) Tanaka × *Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf. | Khasi papeda × trifoliate orange | Khasi papeda × oranger trifolié | Khasi-Papeda × Dreiblättrige Orange | papeda de Khasi × naranjo trifoliado |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | [CITFO\_MIC](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=9255) |  | CITRU\_MIC | *Citrus* ×*microcarpa* Bunge | *Citrus madurensis* auct.; *Citrus microcarpa* Bunge; *Citrus mitis* Blanco; *Citrus reticulata* × *Fortunella japonica*; ×*Citrofortunella mitis* (Blanco) J. W. Ingram & H. E. Moore; *×Citrofortunella microcarpa* (Bunge) Wijnands | calamondin; calamansi; kalamansi; calamonding; China orange; Panama orange; Philippine lime; calamandarin; golden lime; musk lime | calamondin; calamansi; lime des Philippines; citron des Philippines; oranger d’appartement; oranger d'intérieur | Calamondinorange; Kalamansi | calamondina; calamansí; naranjita de San José |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | [TG/83](https://www.upov.int/edocs/tgdocs/en/tg083.pdf) | [PONCI\_POL](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=4475) |  | CITRU\_POL | *Citrus polytrifolia*Govaerts | *Poncirus* ×*polyandra* S. Q. Ding et al.; *Poncirus polyandra* S. Q. Ding et al. | Fumin trifoliate orange; Fuming trifoliate orange; evergreen trifoliate orange; Fumin evergreen trifoliate orange | poncirus polyandre |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | [TG/201](https://www.upov.int/edocs/tgdocs/en/tg201.pdf) | [CITFO\_RHI](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=8249) |  | CITRU\_RJA | *Citrus reticulata* Blanco *× Citrus hindsii* (Champ. ex Benth.) Govaerts | *Citrus* ×*aurantium* L. var. *chrysocarpa* (Hassk.) ined. × *Citrus* *hindsii* (Champ. ex Benth.) K. M. Liu, G. W. Hu, and X. Z. Cai, comb. nov. | mandarin × Hong Kong kumquat; mandarinquat? | mandarinier × kumquat de Hong Kong | none | mandarino × kumquat de Hong Kong |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  | [CITRO\_RTR](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=1327) |  | CITRU\_RTR | Hybrids between *Citrus reticulata* Blanco × *Citrus trifoliata* L. | *Citrus reticulata* Blanco × *Poncirus trifoliata* (L.) Raf. | citrandarin | citrandarin | Citrandarin | citrandarin |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | [FORTU\_POL](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=7265) |  | CITRU\_SWI | *Citrus* ×*swinglei* Burkill ex Harms | *Fortunella* x *polyandra* (Ridl.) Tanaka; *Fortunella polyandra* (Ridl.) Tanaka; *Citrus swinglei* | Malayan kumquat; long-leaved kumquat; Swingle's kumquat; hedge lime | kumquat de Malasie | Malayische Kumquat | kumquat Malayo |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | [CITRO\_TLI](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=7407) |  | CITRU\_TLI | *Citrus trifoliata* L. × *Citrus ×limon* (L.) Osbeck | *Poncirus trifoliata* × *Citrus limon* | citremon | citremon | Citremon | citremon |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | [TG/83](https://www.upov.int/edocs/tgdocs/en/tg083.pdf) | [PONCI\_TRI](https://www.upov.int/genie/details.xhtml?cropId=4476) |  | CITRU\_TRI | *Citrus trifoliata* L. | *Poncirus trifoliata (L.) Raf.* | trifoliate orange; Japanese bitter orange; Chinese bitter orange; hardy orange | citronnier épineux; oranger trifolié | Dreiblättrige Orange; Bitterorange; Bitterzitrone | naranjo trifoliado; naranjo espinoso; naranjo trébol |

[Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

REPORT ON DATA CONTRIBUTED TO PLUTO BY MEMBERS OF THE UNION AND OTHER CONTRIBUTORS

| Contributor | | Number of applications for PBR in 2024[[10]](#footnote-11) | Number of new data submissions to PLUTO | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| African Intellectual Property Organization | OA | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Albania | AL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Argentina | AR | 341 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 30 | 17 | 32 | 19 |
| Armenia | AM | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 |
| Australia | AU | 295 | 21 | 5 | 5 | 16 | 8 | 2 | 0 |
| Austria | AT | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| Azerbaijan | AZ | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Belarus | BY | 47 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Belgium | BE | 0 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 1 |
| Bolivia (Plurinational State of) | BO | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | BA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brazil | BR | 336 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 11 |
| Bulgaria | BG | 17 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 1 |
| Canada | CA | 338 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 11 | 9 |
| Chile | CL | 103 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 5 |
| China | CN | 16,177 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Colombia | CO | 114 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Costa Rica | CR | 11 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Croatia | HR | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Czech Republic | CZ | 50 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 6 |
| Denmark | DK | 3 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Dominican Republic | DO | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Ecuador | EC | 72 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Egypt | EG | 90 | 0 | - | - | 1 | 2 | 10 | 1 |
| Estonia | EE | 8 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 1 |
| European Union | QZ | 3,268 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 4 |
| Finland | FI | 11 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| France | FR | 98 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 2 |
| Georgia | GE | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Germany | DE | 22 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 3 |
| Ghana | GH | 27 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hungary | HU | 37 | 13 | 14 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 2 |
| Iceland | IS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ireland | IE | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Israel | IL | 49 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Italy | IT | 13 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Japan | JP | 599 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Jordan | JO | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Kenya | KE | 88 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Kyrgyzstan | KG | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Latvia | LV | 17 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Lithuania | LT | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mexico | MX | 255 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| Montenegro | ME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Morocco | MA | 87 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Netherlands (Kingdom of the) | NL | 800 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 2 | 2 |
| New Zealand | NZ | 105 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 |
| Nicaragua | NI | n/a | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Nigeria | NG | n/a | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| North Macedonia | MK | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Norway | NO | 15 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Oman | OM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Panama | PA | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Paraguay | PY | 39 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Peru | PE | 51 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Poland | PL | 133 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 2 |
| Portugal | PT | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Republic of Korea | KR | 573 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Republic of Moldova | MD | 24 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Romania | RO | 41 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Russian Federation | RU | 809 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | VC | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Serbia | RS | 57 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Singapore | SG | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Slovakia | SK | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| Slovenia | SI | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| South Africa | ZA | 237 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Spain | ES | 62 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 2 |
| Sweden | SE | 3 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 1 |
| Switzerland | CH | 45 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 3 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | TT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tunisia | TN | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Türkiye | TR | 224 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Ukraine | UA | 734 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 23 | 9 |
| United Kingdom | GB | 796 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 12 | 1,373\* |
| United Republic of Tanzania | TZ | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| United States of America | US | 467 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 18 | 14 |
| Uruguay | UY | 62 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Uzbekistan | UZ | 118 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Viet Nam | VN | 258 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| OECD | QM | - | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| **Total** |  | **29,250** | **257** | **218** | **56** | **193** | **196** | **273** | **1,522** |

\* Automatic contribution from UPOV e‑PVP Administration Module.

[End of Annex II and of document]

1. Held in Geneva on October 21 and 22, 2024. See document TC/60/8 “Report”, paragraph 40. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Held in Geneva on October 21 and 22, 2024. See document TC/60/8 “Report”, paragraph 40. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. See documents TWO/57/10 “Report”, paragraphs 28 and 29; TWV/59/19 “Report”, paragraphs 22 and 23; TWA/54/7 “Report”, paragraphs 11 and 12; and TWF/56/7 “Report”, paragraphs 23 and 24. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Held in Geneva, on October 21 and 22, 2024. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. See documents C/[session]/INF/6 “List of the taxa protected by the members of the Union; C/[session]/INF/5 “Cooperation in Examination”; TC/[session]/INF/4 “List of genera and species for which authorities have practical experience in the examination of distinctness, uniformity and stability”; and TC/[session]/2 “Test Guidelines”. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Held in Geneva, on October 25 and 26, 2021. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Technical Committee, sixtieth session, held in Geneva on October 21 and 22, 2024. See document TC/60/8 “Report”, paragraph 56. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Held in Bursa, Türkiye, from June 23 to 26, 2025. See document TWF/56/7 “Report”, paragraphs 25 to 31. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Held on October 30, 2019. See document CAJ/76/9 “Report”, paragraph 46. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. See document C/58/7 “Plant variety protection statistics for the period 2019-2023”.

    Highlighted in grey indicates data provided via the CPVO. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)