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# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

 The purpose of this document is to provide an update on developments concerning: the GENIE database; UPOV Codes; and the PLUTO database.

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

(a) the developments concerning UPOV codes, as set out in paragraph 8;

(b) that the TC, at its fifty-second session, agreed to invite the European Union to make a proposal to the TWPs, at their sessions in 2016, to revise the Guide to the UPOV Code System with regard to UPOV codes for hybrid genera and species, as set out in paragraph 10;

(c) the summary of contributions to the PLUTO database from 2013 to 2015 and the current situation of members of the Union on data contribution, as presented in the Annex to this document;

(d) that the WG-DEN, at its first meeting, agreed to defer the consideration of the matters concerning the possible expansion of the content of the PLUTO database to include all recognized varieties, including those that have not been, or were no longer, registered/protected in document UPOV/WG-DEN/1/4 “Expansion of the Content of the PLUTO database” until its second, or a subsequent, meeting;

(e) that the WG-DEN, at its first meeting, agreed to defer the consideration of the proposal to accept accents and special characters in denominations provided in the PLUTO database in document UPOV/WG-DEN/1/4 4 “Expansion of the Content of the PLUTO database” until its second, or a subsequent, meeting; and

 (d) that matters concerning a UPOV denomination similarity search tool, non-acceptable terms for variety denominations, and the revision of document UPOV/INF/12 “Explanatory notes on variety denominations under the UPOV Convention” 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

 TWPs: Technical Working Parties

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

 WG-DEN Working Group on Variety Denominations
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# PURPOSE

 The purpose of this document is to provide an update on developments concerning: the GENIE database; UPOV Codes; and the PLUTO database.

# GENIE DATABASE

 It is recalled that the GENIE database (<http://www.upov.int/genie/en/>) has been developed to provide, for example, online information on the status of protection (see document C/[session]/6), cooperation in examination (see document C/[session]/5), experience in DUS testing (see document TC/[session]/4), and existence of UPOV Test Guidelines (see document TC/[session]/2) for different GENera and specIEs (hence GENIE), and is used to generate the relevant Council and Technical Committee (TC) documents concerning that information. In addition, the GENIE database is the repository of the UPOV codes and also provides information concerning alternative botanical and common names.

# UPOV CODE SYSTEM

## Guide to the UPOV Code System

 The “Guide to the UPOV Code System” is available on the UPOV website (see <http://www.upov.int/genie/en/pdf/upov_code_system.pdf>).

## UPOV code developments

 In 2015, 188 new UPOV codes were created and amendments were made to 11 existing UPOV codes. The total number of UPOV codes in the GENIE database at the end of 2015 was 7,992.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Year |
|  |  |
|  | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| New UPOV codes | n/a | 300(approx.) | 148 | 114 | 173 | 212 | 209 | 577 | 188 |
| Amendments | n/a | 30(approx.) | 17 | 6 | 12 | 5 |  47\* | 37 | 11 |
| Total UPOV Codes (at end of year) | 6,169 | 6,346 | 6,582 | 6,683 | 6,851 | 7,061 | 7,251 | 7,808 | 7,992 |

\* including changes to UPOV codes resulting from the amendment of the “Guide to the UPOV Code System” concerning hybrids (see document TC/49/6).

 In accordance with the procedure set out in Section 3.3 of the Guide to the UPOV Code System, the Office of the Union prepared tables of UPOV code additions and amendments, for checking by the relevant authorities, for each of the TWP sessions in 2016.

 The TC, at its fifty-second session[[1]](#footnote-2), agreed to invite the European Union to make a proposal to the TWPs, at their sessions in 2016, to revise the Guide to the UPOV Code System with regard to UPOV codes for hybrid genera and species[[2]](#footnote-3).

 The CAJ is invited to note:

(a) the developments concerning UPOV codes, as set out in paragraph 8; and

(b) that the TC, at its fifty-second session, agreed to invite the European Union to make a proposal to the TWPs, at their sessions in 2016, to revise the Guide to the UPOV Code System with regard to UPOV codes for hybrid genera and species, as set out in paragraph 10;

# PLUTO DATABASE

## Program for improvements to the PLUTO database (“Program”)

 The CAJ, at its sixty-eighth session[[3]](#footnote-4), considered document CAJ/68/6 “UPOV information databases” and approved the amendments to the program for improvements to the PLUTO database (“Program”) as set out in document CAJ/68/6, Annex II, subject to certain further amendments agreed at that session[[4]](#footnote-5).

 The program reflecting amendments approved at previous sessions is available in document CAJ/69/6 “UPOV Information Databases”, Annex I.

 The following paragraph provides a summary of developments concerning the Program since the seventy-second session of the CAJ[[5]](#footnote-6),

### Provision of assistance to contributors (Program: section 2)

 The Annex to this document provides a summary of the contributions to the PLUTO database from 2013 to 2015 and the current situation of members of the Union on data contribution.

##

## Content of the PLUTO Database

### Variety data no longer included in the PLUTO database (historical data) and other varieties (new data)

 The WG-DST, at its second meeting[[6]](#footnote-7), 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 those that had not been, or were no longer, registered/protected[[7]](#footnote-8).

 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 those that have not been, or were no longer, registered/protected as set out in document CAJ/72/6 “Information Databases”, paragraph 24, be referred to the WG-DEN[[8]](#footnote-9).

 The WG-DEN, at its first meeting[[9]](#footnote-10), agreed to defer the consideration of the matters concerning the possible expansion of the content of the PLUTO database to include all recognized varieties, including those that have not been, or were no longer, registered/protected in document UPOV/WG-DEN/1/4 “Expansion of the Content of the PLUTO database” until its second, or a subsequent, meeting[[10]](#footnote-11).

### Accents and special characters

 The WG-DST, at its second meeting,[[11]](#footnote-12) 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,[[12]](#footnote-13), [[13]](#footnote-14) it would be possible for those elements to be included.[[14]](#footnote-15)

 The CAJ, at its seventy-second session, 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 [American Standard Code for Information Interchange] representation, as defined in ISO [International Standards Organization] Standard 646. It agreed that the matter should be referred to the WG-DEN[[15]](#footnote-16).

 The WG-DEN, at its first meeting, agreed to defer the consideration of the proposal to accept accents and special characters in denominations provided in the PLUTO database in document UPOV/WG-DEN/1/4 “Expansion of the Content of the PLUTO database” until its second, or a subsequent, meeting.

### UPOV denomination similarity search tool

 Matters concerning UPOV denomination similarity search tool are reported in document CAJ/72/3 “Variety Denominations”.

### Non-acceptable terms for variety denominations

 Matters concerning non-acceptable terms for variety denominations are reported in document CAJ/72/3 “Variety Denominations”.

### Revision of document UPOV/INF/12 “Explanatory notes on variety denominations under the UPOV Convention”

 The possible revision of document UPOV/INF/12 “Explanatory notes on variety denominations under the UPOV Convention” is reported in document CAJ/73/3 “Variety Denominations”.

 The CAJ is invited to note:

(a) the summary of contributions to the PLUTO database from 2013 to 2015 and the current situation of members of the Union on data contribution, as presented in the Annex to this document;

(b) that the WG-DEN, at its first meeting, agreed to defer the consideration of the matters concerning the possible expansion of the content of the PLUTO database to include all recognized varieties, including those that have not been, or were no longer, registered/protected in document UPOV/WG-DEN/1/4 “Expansion of the Content of the PLUTO database” until its second, or a subsequent, meeting;

(c) that the WG-DEN, at its first meeting, agreed to defer the consideration of the proposal to accept accents and special characters in denominations provided in the PLUTO database in document UPOV/WG-DEN/1/4 “Expansion of the Content of the PLUTO database” until its second, or a subsequent, meeting; and

 (d) that matters concerning a UPOV denomination similarity search tool, non‑acceptable terms for variety denominations, and the revision of document UPOV/INF/12 “Explanatory notes on variety denominations under the UPOV Convention” are reported in document CAJ/72/3 “Variety Denominations”.

[Annex follows]

REPORT ON DATA CONTRIBUTED TO THE PLANT VARIETY DATABASE BY MEMBERS OF THE UNION AND OTHER CONTRIBUTORS AND ASSISTANCE FOR DATA CONTRIBUTION

| Contributor | Number of applications for Plant Breeders’ Rights in 2014 | Number of new data submissions to the Plant Variety Database in 2012[[16]](#footnote-17) | Number of new data submissions to the Plant Variety Database in 2013 | Number of new data submissions to the Plant Variety Database in 2014 | Number of new data submissions to the Plant Variety Database in 2015 | Current situation |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| African Intellectual Property Organization | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | E-mail with instructions for contribution sent on October 31, 2014. Awaiting data. |
| Albania | 0 (2013) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | [Contributing data]Awaiting submission of missing data on the data received on February 2, 2015. |
| Argentina | 253 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | Participated in the training course in 2015 and planned to start regularly submitting data from December 15, 2015. |
| Australia | 341 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 5 | [Contributing data]  |
| [[17]](#footnote-18)\*Austria | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 |  |
| Azerbaijan | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Awaiting reply to e-mail of October 1, 2014 requesting data.  |
| Belarus | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Participated in the training course in 2014 and planned to submit data every March. |
| \*Belgium | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 |  |
| Bolivia (Plurinational State of) | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Participated in the training course in 2015 and planned to submit data by end of December, 2015. |
| Brazil | 344 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | [Contributing data] |
| \*Bulgaria | 21 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 12 |  |
| Canada | 345 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 7 | [Contributing data] |
| Chile | 134 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | [Contributing data] |
| China | 2,026 | 1 |  0 | 1 | 2 | [Contributing data] Ministry of Agriculture submitted data on May 20, 2015, and State Forestry Administration on October 23, 2015. |
| Colombia | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Participated in the training course in 2015 and plans to submit data by February, 2016.  |
| Costa Rica | 20 | (1) |  0 | 2 | 1 | [Contributing data]Participated in the training course in 2015. Data submitted on October 16, 2015. Plans to submit next data as soon as possible. |
| \*Croatia | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  |
| \*Czech Republic | 99 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 3 |  |
| \*Denmark | 16 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 12 |  |
| Dominican Republic | 0 (2011) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Awaiting reply to e-mail of October 21, 2014 requesting data. |
| Ecuador | 50 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | [Contributing data]Participated in the training course in 2015 and planned to submit data on the first week of December, 2015. |
| \*Estonia | 7 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 9 |  |
| \*European Union | 3625 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 10 |  |
| \*Finland | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |  |
| \*France | 102 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 13 |  |
| Georgia | 61 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | [Contributing data] |
| \*Germany | 69 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 11 |  |
| \*Hungary | 30 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 16 |  |
| \*Iceland | 0 (2012) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| \*Ireland | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Israel | 79 | 0 |  0 | 2 | 1 | [Contributing data] |
| \*Italy | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 8 |  |
| Japan | 1,018 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | [Contributing data] |
| Jordan | 12 | (1) |  0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Kenya | 69 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | [Contributing data] |
| Kyrgyzstan | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | [Contributing data] |
| \*Latvia | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |
| \*Lithuania | 7 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Mexico | 180 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | [Contributing data]Participated in the training course in 2015 and planned to submit data by end of December, 2015.  |
| Montenegro | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| Morocco | 76 | 1 |  1 | 0 | 2 | [Contributing data] |
| \*Netherlands | 699 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 10 |  |
| New Zealand | 148 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 6 | [Contributing data] |
| Nicaragua | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Participated in the training course in 2015 and planned to submit data by end of November 2015.  |
| \*Norway | 18 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 |  |
| Oman | 0 (2009) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Participated in the training course in 2015 and plan to submit data upon receipt of applications. |
| Panama | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Participated in the training course in 2015 and planned to submit data by end of December, 2015 (received new data on January 18, 2016). |
| Paraguay | 34(2013) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | [Contributing data]Participated in the training course in 2015 and planned to submit data by mid-December, 2015. Submitted data on December 25, 2015. |
| Peru | 56 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | [Contributing data] |
| \*Poland | 75 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 3 |  |
| \*Portugal | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |  |
| Republic of Korea | 661 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | [Contributing data] |
| Republic of Moldova | 34 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | [Contributing data] |
| \*Romania | 32 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 |  |
| Russian Federation | 722 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 5 | [Contributing data] |
| Serbia | 53 | - | 3 | 2 | 3 | [Contributing data] |
| Singapore | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Awaiting reply to E‑mail on July 9, 2014 requesting data.  |
| \*Slovakia | 16 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 4 |  |
| \*Slovenia | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 |  |
| South Africa | 243 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | Participated in the training course in 2015 and planned to submit data by end of December, 2015. |
| \*Spain | 54 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 5 |  |
| \*Sweden | 0 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 11 |  |
| \*Switzerland | 53 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 6 |  |
| The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Participated in the training course in 2014 and planned to submit data upon receipt of applications.  |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 0(2013) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Participated in the training course in 2014 and planned to submit some data by the third week of January 2015.  |
| Tunisia | 7 | 0 |  0 | 0 | 0 | Awaiting reply to e-mail of July 23, 2014 requesting data. Data received and awaiting confirmation of tags on August 29, 2014, |
| \*Turkey | 202 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Ukraine | 1,447 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Unable to provide data at present. |
| \*United Kingdom | 36 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 11 |  |
| United Republic of Tanzania | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| United States of America | 1,567 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 17 | [Contributing data] |
| Uruguay | 49 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | [Contributing data]Participated in the training course in 2015 and planned to submit data by end of December, 2015.  |
| Uzbekistan | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Participated in the training course in 2014 and planned to submit data in 2015. |
| Viet Nam | 109 | 0 |  0 | 0 | 0 | Participated in the training course in 2014 and planned to submit data in 2015. |
| OECD | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | [Contributing data] |

[End of Annex and of document]

1. Held in Geneva, from March 14 to 16, 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. See document TC/52/29 Rev. “Revised Report”, paragraph 163. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Held in Geneva, held on October 21, 2013 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. See document CAJ/68/10 “Report on the Conclusions”, paragraphs 23 to 26 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Held in Geneva, on October 26 and 27, 2015 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Held in Geneva on June 9, 2015 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. See document UPOV/WG-DST/2/6 “Report”, paragraph 30 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. See document CAJ/72/9 “Report on the Conclusions”, paragraph 40 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Held in Geneva, on March 18 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. See document WG-DEN/1/6 “Report”, paragraph 55 [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Held in Geneva on June 9, 2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. See document CAJ/69/6 “Information Databases”, Annex I “Program for Improvements to the Plant Variety Database”, Section 3.1.3”. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. “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 (˜, ˆ, ¨, º, etc.) are not accepted. Only characters of the English alphabet may be used.” [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. See document UPOV/WG-DST/2/6 “Report”, paragraphs 17 and 18. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. See document CAJ/72/9 “Report on the Conclusions”, paragraph 39 [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. ‘3’ indicates that new data was submitted for all three (3) new versions of the UPOV-ROM issued in 2012.

( ) Parenthesis indicates that data are currently being processed. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. \* Data provided via the CPVO. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)