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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 Technical Committee (TC) is invited to:

(a) note that a specification document explaining the data structure and functions of the GENIE database is being developed by the Office of the Union in order that the IT-related maintenance can be provided in the future. In addition to “bug-fixing” maintenance, a modification of the database is needed for uploading certain type of data when notes apply. Furthermore, improvements to the generation of reports for documents for the Council and relevant committees need to be made. This work is planned to be completed by 2018;

(b) note that 173 new UPOV codes were created in 2016 and the total of 8,149 UPOV codes are included in the GENIE database;

(c) note that the Office of the Union will prepare tables of UPOV codes additions and amendments, for checking by the relevant authorities, for each of the TWP sessions in 2017, as set out in paragraph 11 of this document;

(d) consider the proposal to revise the Guide to the UPOV Code System in relation to the principal botanical name for inter-generic and interspecific hybrids, as set out in paragraphs 12 to 15 of this document;

(e) note that, in order to avoid any misinterpretation, the Community Plant Variety Office of the European Union (CPVO) would make it clear that the information provided to the Office of the Union would be in alphabetical order;

(f) note the summary of contributions to the PLUTO database from 2013 to 2016 and the current situation of members of the Union on data contribution, as presented in the Annex to this document;

(g) note that the Administrative and Legal Committee (CAJ), at its seventy-third session, had noted that the Working Group on Variety Denominations (WG-DEN), at its first meeting, had agreed to defer the work concerning the expansion of the content of the PLUTO database until its second or subsequent meeting;

(h) note that the WG-DEN, at its second meeting, had agreed that matters that it was not able to consider at its second meeting would be considered at its third meeting on the basis of the document presented at the second meeting; and

(i) note that the third meeting of the WG-DEN will be held in Geneva, on April 7, 2017.

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

WG-DEN: Working Group on Variety Denominations
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# GENIE DATABASE

## Background

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 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.

## Maintenance of the GENIE database

The GENIE database was created with the help of the Information Technology Department of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). The IT-related maintenance of the GENIE database was also provided by WIPO. However, since 2016, WIPO no longer has staff to provide such maintenance work and UPOV is now responsible for IT-related maintenance of the GENIE database.

A specification document explaining the data structure and functions of the GENIE database is being developed by the Office of the Union in order that the IT-related maintenance can be provided in the future. In addition to corrective maintenance, a modification of the database is needed for uploading certain type of data when notes apply. Furthermore, improvements to the generation of reports for documents for the Council and relevant committees need to be made. This work is planned to be completed by the end of 2018.

*The TC is invited to note that a specification document explaining the data structure and functions of the GENIE database is being developed by the Office of the Union in order that the IT-related maintenance can be provided in the future. In addition to “bug-fixing” maintenance, a modification of the database is needed for uploading certain type of data when notes apply. Furthermore, improvements to the generation of reports for documents for the Council and relevant committees need to be made. This work is planned to be completed by 2018.*

# 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 2016, 173 new UPOV codes were created and amendments were made to 16 existing UPOV codes. The total number of UPOV codes in the GENIE database at the end of 2016 was 8,149.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Year | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | | | | | |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| New UPOV codes | 300 (approx.) | 148 | 114 | 173 | 212 | 209 | 577 | 188 | 173 |
| Amendments | 30 (approx.) | 17 | 6 | 12 | 5 | 47\* | 37 | 11 | 16 |
| Total UPOV Codes (at end of year) | 6,346 | 6,582 | 6,683 | 6,851 | 7,061 | 7,251 | 7,808 | 7,992 | 8,149 |

\* 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 will prepare tables of UPOV code additions and amendments, for checking by the relevant authorities, for each of the TWP sessions in 2017.

## Proposal to the “Guide to the UPOV Code System” on the Principal Botanical Name for Inter-generic and Interspecific Hybrids

The TC, at its fifty-second session, held in Geneva from March 14 to 16, 2016, 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 (see document TC/52/29 Rev. “Revised Report”, paragraph 163).

The TWC, TWO, TWV, TWA and TWF considered documents TWC/34/23, TWO/49/18, TWV/50/18, TWA/45/18 and TWF/47/25 “Proposal to the ‘Guide to the UPOV Code System’ on the Principal Botanical Name for Inter-Generic and Interspecific Hybrids” prepared by an expert from the European Union, respectively, which contained the following proposal:

“11. It is proposed:

* to reconsider the possibility of the registration of the Principal Botanical Name for intergeneric and interspecific hybrids in the UPOV GENIE database as described in the “Guide to the UPOV Code System” – its point 2.2.6 taking into account the wish of authorities to harmonize the names with the UPOV database and the experience of authorities as regards registration of botanical taxa for varieties applied for plant breeder’s rights. In particular, it is proposed to consider the option to register hybrids in the alphabetical order and to indicate the author’s names;
* to exchange opinion about the registration policy under the genus names by different authorities;
* to consider if there could be a possibility to indicate that a variety is a complex hybrid.”

The TWC, TWO, TWV, TWA and TWF considered the proposal to present the principal botanical name for UPOV Codes of hybrid genera and species indicating the parents in alphabetical order. The TWO, TWV, TWA and TWF noted the existence of different procedures among members and noted that in some members the information on parents of a hybrid ornamental variety were only published when confirmed and indicating the female parent first. The TWO, TWV, TWA and TWF noted that in one member the information on parents of a hybrid ornamental variety were published according to the information provided by the applicant. On that basis, the TWV, TWA and TWF agreed that it would not be appropriate to revise the Guide to the UPOV Code System in relation to the principal botanical name for inter-generic and interspecific hybrids (see documents TWC/34/32, paragraph 113, TWO/49/25, paragraph 73, TWV/50/25, paragraph 83, TWA/45/18, paragraph 66 and TWF/47/25, paragraph 83).

The TWF noted the comment made by the expert from the European Union that the creation of new botanical name in GENIE database, upon the request from CPVO, cannot be seen in accordance with the "Guide to the UPOV code system”. In order to avoid any misinterpretation, the CPVO makes it clear that the information provided to the Office of the Union is in alphabetical order (see document TWF/47/25, paragraph 84).

The TC is invited to:

(a) note that 173 new UPOV codes were created in 2016 and the total of 8,149 UPOV codes are included in the GENIE database;

(b) note that the Office of the Union will prepare tables of UPOV codes additions and amendments, for checking by the relevant authorities, for each of the TWP sessions in 2017, as set out in paragraph 11 of this document;

(c) consider the proposal to revise the Guide to the UPOV Code System in relation to the principal botanical name for intergeneric and interspecific hybrids, as set out in paragraphs 12 to 15 of this document; and

*(d) note that, in order to avoid any misinterpretation, the CPVO would make it clear that the information provided to the Office of the Union would be in alphabetical order.*

# PLUTO DATABASE

## Program for improvements to the PLUTO database

The CAJ, at its sixty-eighth session, held on October 21, 2013, 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 (see document CAJ/68/10 “Report on the Conclusions”, paragraphs 23 to 26).

The Program reflecting amendments approved at previous sessions is available in document TC/50/6 “UPOV Information Databases”, Annex I.

The following paragraphs provide a summary of developments concerning the Program since the fifty‑second session of the TC, held in Geneva, from March 14 to 16, 2016.

### 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 2016 and the current situation of members of the Union on data contribution.

## Search tools

Matters concerning the possible development of a similarity search tool for variety denomination purposes are reported in document TC/53/12 “Variety Denominations”.

## Content of the PLUTO Database

The background of this matter is provided in document TC/52/6 “UPOV Information databases”.

The TC, at its fifty-second session, held in Geneva, from March 14 to 16, 2016, noted that the CAJ, at its seventy-second session, held in Geneva, October 26 and 27, 2015, had agreed that the WG-DEN should consider proposals for the expansion of the content of the PLUTO database to include all recognized varieties, including those that had not been, or were no longer, registered/protected (see document TC/52/29 Rev. “Revised Report”, paragraph 168).

The WG-DEN, at its first meeting, held in Geneva on March 18, 2016, agreed to defer the consideration of the matters in document UPOV/WG-DEN/1/4 “Expansion of the Content of the PLUTO Database“ until its second, or a subsequent, meeting (see document UPOV/WG-DEN/1/6 “Report”, paragraph 55).

The CAJ, at its seventy-third session, held in Geneva on October 25, 2016, noted the work by the WG-DEN concerning the expansion of the content of the PLUTO database (see document CAJ/73/10 “Report on the Conclusions”, paragraph 28).

The WG-DEN, at its second meeting, held in Geneva on October 25, 2016, agreed that matters that it was not able to consider at its second meeting would be considered at its third meeting on the basis of the document presented at the second meeting, and that no new documents would be prepared for the third meeting.

The third meeting of the WG-DEN will be held in Geneva, on April 7, 2017.

The TC is invited to:

(a) note the summary of contributions to the PLUTO database from 2013 to 2016 and the current situation of members of the Union on data contribution, as presented in the Annex to this document;

(b) note that the CAJ, at its seventy-third session, had noted that the WG-DEN, at its first meeting, had agreed to defer the work concerning the expansion of the content of the PLUTO database until its second or subsequent meeting;

(c) note that the WG-DEN, at its second meeting, had agreed that matters that it was not able to consider at its second meeting would be considered at its third meeting on the basis of the document presented at the second meeting; and

(d) note that the third meeting of the WG-DEN will be held in Geneva, on April 7, 2017.

[The 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 2015 | 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 | Number of new data submissions to the Plant Variety Database in 2016 | Current situation |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| African Intellectual Property Organization | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | A reminder e-mail with instructions for contribution sent on February 23, 2017, following receipt of incomplete data. |
| Albania | 0 (2013) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | Contributing data verification |
| Argentina | 285 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | [Contributing data] |
| Australia | 359 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 7 | [Contributing data] |
| [[1]](#footnote-2)\*Austria | 0 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |  |
| Azerbaijan | 19 (2014) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Awaiting reply to e-mail of November 4, 2016, inviting data. |
| Belarus | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | [Contributing data] |
| \*Belgium | 1 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 5 |  |
| Bolivia (Plurinational State of) | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | [Contributing data] |
| Brazil | 355 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 0 | [Contributing data] |
| \*Bulgaria | 16 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 6 |  |
| Canada | 273 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 11 | [Contributing data] |
| Chile | 107 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 6 | [Contributing data] |
| China | 2,342 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | [Contributing data] (State Forestry Administration) |
| Colombia | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Data received on March 1, 2017. Received an e-mail on March 13, 2017, reporting that new data to replace the data of March 1, 2017 will be sent soon. |
| Costa Rica | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | [Contributing data] |
| \*Croatia | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 |  |
| \*Czech Republic | 80 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 6 |  |
| \*Denmark | 1 | 6 | 8 | 12 | 11 |  |
| Dominican Republic | 0 (2011) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Awaiting reply to e-mail of February 23, 2017, inviting data. |
| Ecuador | 50 (2014) | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | Awaiting reply to e-mail of February 23, 2017, inviting data. |
| \*Estonia | 7 (2014) | 4 | 4 | 9 | 3 |  |
| \*European Union | 3,111 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 13 |  |
| \*Finland | 13 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| \*France | 119 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 11 |  |
| Georgia | 24 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | [Contributing data] |
| \*Germany | 66 | 6 | 8 | 11 | 12 |  |
| \*Hungary | 26 | 6 | 6 | 16 | 19 |  |
| \*Iceland | 0 (2012) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| \*Ireland | 2 (2014) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Israel | 50 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | [Contributing data] |
| \*Italy | 4 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 6 |  |
| Japan | 1,126 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | [Contributing data] |
| Jordan | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | [Contributing data] |
| Kenya | 71 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | [Contributing data] |
| Kyrgyzstan | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | Data in preparation |
| \*Latvia | 7 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |
| \*Lithuania | 11 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |
| Mexico | 193 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | [Contributing data] |
| Montenegro | n/a | - | - | 0 | 0 | Awaiting reply to e-mail of March 1, 2017, inviting data. |
| Morocco | 50 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | [Contributing data] |
| \*Netherlands | 799 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 11 |  |
| New Zealand | 123 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 5 | [Contributing data] |
| Nicaragua | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Participated in the training course in 2015 and planned to submit data by end of November 2015. Awaiting reply to e-mail of February 23, 2017, inviting data. |
| \*Norway | 36 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 |  |
| Oman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Received data on March 16, 2017. |
| Panama | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | [Contributing data] |
| Paraguay | 34 (2013) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | [Contributing data] |
| Peru | 63 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | Planning to submit data by the end of April, 2017 |
| \*Poland | 97 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 |  |
| \*Portugal | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  |
| Republic of Korea | 757 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | [Contributing data] Clarifications needed with regard to latest data provided before uploading in PLUTO |
| Republic of Moldova | 37 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | [Contributing data] |
| \*Romania | 27 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |
| Russian Federation | 743 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | [Contributing data] |
| Serbia | 46 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | [Contributing data] |
| Singapore | 6 (2014) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No data |
| \*Slovakia | 19 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 5 |  |
| \*Slovenia | 0 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  |
| South Africa | 350 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | [Contributing data] |
| \*Spain | 68 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  |
| \*Sweden | 1 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 12 |  |
| \*Switzerland | 64 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 5 |  |
| 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. Awaiting reply to e-mail of February 23, 2017, inviting data. |
| Tunisia | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Awaiting reply to e-mail February 23, 2017, inviting data submission |
| \*Turkey | 231 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  |
| Ukraine | 1,075 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Awaiting reply to e-mail of March 1, 2017, inviting data. |
| \*United Kingdom | 20 | 6 | 10 | 11 | 13 |  |
| United Republic of Tanzania | n/a | - | - | 0 | 0 |  |
| United States of America | 1,634 | 6 | 10 | 17 | 16 | [Contributing data] |
| Uruguay | 49 (2014) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | [Contributing data] Clarifications needed with regard to latest data provided before uploading in PLUTO |
| Uzbekistan | 29 (2014) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Participated in the training course in 2014 and planned to submit data in 2015. Awaiting reply to e-mail of March 7, 2017. |
| Viet Nam | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Participated in the training course in 2014 and planned to submit data in 2015. Data in preparation. |
| OECD | - | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | [Contributing data] |
| Number of UPOV members that contributed to the PLUTO database | | 44 | 48 | 45 | 52 |  |
| Percentage of UPOV members that contributed to the PLUTO database | | 62% | 67% | 61% | 70% |  |

[End of Annex and of document]

1. ( ) Parenthesis indicates that data are currently being processed.

   \* Data provided via the CPVO. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)