UPOV
International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants

E

Technical Working Party for Vegetables
Fifty-Sixth Session
Virtual meeting, April 18 to 22, 2022

Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops
Fifty-First Session
Cambridge, United Kingdom, May 23 to 27, 2022

Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees
Fifty-Fourth Session
Hanover, Germany, June 13 to 17, 2022

Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops
Fifty-Third Session
Virtual meeting, July 11 to 15, 2022

Technical Working Party on Testing Methods and Techniques
First Session
Virtual meeting, September 19 to 23, 2022

TWP/6/3

Original: English
Date: March 29, 2022

UPOV PRISMA

Document prepared by the Office of the Union

Disclaimer: this document does not represent UPOV policies or guidance

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The purpose of this document is to report on developments concerning UPOV PRISMA.

2. The Technical Working Parties are invited to note the developments concerning UPOV PRISMA.

3. The structure of this document is as follows:

BACKGROUND

4. The background to the development of the Electronic Application Form (EAF, now UPOV PRISMA) prior to the Technical Working Parties in 2021 is provided in document TWP/5/3 “UPOV PRISMA”.

DEVELOPMENTS IN UPOV BODIES

Technical Committee (TC) in October 2021

5. The Technical Committee (TC), at its fifty-seventh session[1], noted the information provided in document TC/57/INF/2 in relation to recent developments in UPOV PRISMA (see document TC/57/25 “Report”, paragraph 88).

Administrative and Legal Committee (CAJ) in October 2021

6. The Administrative and Legal Committee (CAJ), at its seventy-eight session[2], noted the information provided in document CAJ/78/INF/4 in relation to recent developments in UPOV PRISMA (see document CAJ/78/10 “Report”, paragraph 44).

Council in October 2021

7. The Council, at its fifty-fifth ordinary session[3], noted the work of the Consultative Committee at its ninety-eighth session, as reported in document C/55/13 “Report by the President on the work of the ninety-eighth session of the Consultative Committee”, including information concerning UPOV PRISMA (see document C/55/18 “Report”, paragraph 18).

EAF/19 meeting in March 2022

8. The following sections report on developments reported and considered at the nineteenth meeting of the EAF, held by virtual means on March 16, 2022 (see document UPOV/EAF/19/3 “Report”).

LAUNCH OF VERSION 2.7

9. Version 2.7 of UPOV PRISMA (Version 2.7) was deployed in January 2022, which incorporated the following:

UPOV members

10. Saint Vincent and Grenadines was introduced in UPOV PRISMA as a new participating authority.

Crops/species

11. Forms were updated for the following participating PBR authorities: European Union, and the Netherlands.

New functionalities

[1] organized via electronic means on October 25 and 26, 2021

[2] organized via electronic means on October 27, 2021

[3] organized via electronic means on October 29, 2021

12. The following new functionalities were introduced:

(a) Possibility to download the list of applications as displayed in the dashboard for PVP office in Excel format;
(b) Introduction of the WIPO IP Portal navigation bar;
(c) Bulk Upload (for maize, European Union);
(d) Provide the Co-agent with the right to view applications of other colleagues.

IT QUALITY SOFTWARE AUDIT

13. In order to reduce the risk of problems when introducing new versions and/ or new functionalities, the following steps would be taken:

- Appoint an external company to perform a software quality audit;
- Organize user acceptance testing (UAT) before going live with any new functionalities.

14. An external company was appointed to perform a software quality audit and reported that according to the test maturity model, UPOV PRISMA had reached maturity level 2: “the organization has a fundamental test approach where some common test practices are implemented such as planning, monitoring and control over test activities”. The following recommendations were provided to move to maturity level 3: “the organization is rather proactive and the test approach is documented and described in standards, procedures, tools and methods”:

1. Know the users and how UPOV PRISMA is used;
2. Focus on what is important and urgent: Automate test cases for regression on the functionalities mostly used and the functionalities that generate 80% of the bugs;
3. Define a clear Test strategy document;
4. For each new requirement, an impact analysis should be made;
5. Define a standard process for test case creation;
6. Use a test repository tool.

15. In relation to user acceptance testing (UAT), it is planned to consult the UPOV PRISMA “Task Force” Group before implementing new functionalities.

16. Further to the above measures to improve the quality of the UPOV PRISMA software, it was decided to organize a code audit, which produced the following recommendations:

1. Implement best practices in terms of coding in order to avoid concurrency and performance issues;
2. Move to the cloud for a better resource management at infrastructure level and keep following the highest security standards ;
3. Develop a dedicated configuration interface for a controlled management of the forms;

17. It is planned to start the implementation of the recommendations in 2022. A report on progress on implementing the recommendations will be made at future EAF meetings.

IMPROVEMENT OF USER-FRIENDLINESS OF UPOV PRISMA

18. In order to improve the user-friendliness of UPOV PRISMA consultations were organized with users to review certain current existing functionalities (copy functionality, assignment of roles).

19. Participants in the UPOV PRISMA Task Force Group were consulted on the proposals made to improve the interface and the navigation through the system.

20. A report on progress will be made at future EAF meetings.

CPVO PARTICIPATION IN UPOV PRISMA

21. The following online meetings UPOV PRISMA Task Force Group were organized on CPVO participation in UPOV PRISMA: November 15, 2021, and February 15, 2022 with interim meetings between CPVO and UPOV.

22. In order to achieve and maintain synchronization of TQs between UPOV PRISMA and CPVO the following projects have been agreed with CPVO:

- Project 1: "Audit" (current issues/ states of affairs) for exchange of data between UPOV PRISMA and CPVO in both directions
- Project 2: Part A: Resolving current issues; Part B : Synchronizing changes by UPOV/CPVO
- Project 3: Implementation of Project 2 outcome: Bi-directional exchange of application data (lettuce, tomato, rose)
- Project 4: Bulk upload of Maize applications from UPOV to CPVO
- Project 5: "Transitional arrangements", to communicate to applicants about the situations in which they can use UPOV PRISMA for applications at the CPVO and the measures that need to be taken until all issues have been resolved

23. A report on progress will be made at future EAF meetings.

USING AN AUTHORITY'S TECHNICAL QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ABSENCE OF UPOV TEST GUIDELINES

24. In relation to the coverage of the Test Guidelines, the following was agreed at the EAF/13 meeting (see document UPOV/EAF/13/3 "Report", paragraphs 19 to 22):

> "20. The participants received a presentation from the Office of the Union, as reproduced in the Annex II of document UPOV/EAF/12/3 "Report", and noted that, for UPOV members following the UPOV Test Guidelines, where there were no UPOV Test Guidelines for a particular crop/species, a generic TQ was available. Alternatively, UPOV members could link these crop/species to a suitable UPOV TG. It was explained that it would not be appropriate to use national TGs for such crops/species because of the high level of maintenance, the translation burden and lack of harmonization. However, it would be possible for UPOV members participating in UPOV PRISMA to agree a common TQ and thereby to retain harmonization and minimize translation work.
>
> "21. The participants noted that, in cases where a participating authority used a national Technical Questionnaire for the Table of Characteristics, for a specific crop, where there was no UPOV Test Guidelines (TGs) and where the generic TQ was not appropriate, there would be a possibility to develop a specific UPOV PRISMA TQ for this crop, subject to a procedure for consultation with other UPOV participating members in UPOV PRISMA and under the condition to follow UPOV TGs TQ and UPOV characteristics.
>
> "22. The participants noted the process of consultation for authorities who do not follow the general approach but follow UPOV TGs TQ and UPOV characteristics, as follows:
>
> 1. Request from Country A for a specific crop (Country A TQ)
> 2. Inform other participating authorities in UPOV PRISMA
> 3. Circulate the Country A TQ to see if there are any objections to use as UPOV PRISMA TQ
> 4. If no objections: Country A TQ becomes UPOV PRISMA TQ (subject to resources available)
> 5. If objections: discussion among interested authorities to explore possibilities to develop a harmonized TQ (and then back to 3)
>
> Any new request would be reported at the subsequent EAF meeting."

25. There are no UPOV Test Guidelines for beet and the approach above was considered but initial feedback indicated that it could be problematic to seek to apply a specific TQ for all UPOV members that use the UPOV TQ for all genera and species.

26. The EAF/19 participants approved the following revised procedure for utilizing authorities' TQs as follows (see document UPOV/EAF/19/03 "Report", paragraphs 16 and 17):

1. Request from Authority A for a specific crop (Authority A TQ)
2. Inform other participating authorities in UPOV PRISMA

3. Circulate the Authority A TQ to see if participating UPOV members that use the UPOV TQ for all genera and species would prefer to:
   (a) use Authority A TQ or
   (b) continue using the generic TQ
4. Implement Authority A TQ for UPOV members who wish to use Authority A TQ (subject to available resources).

27. According to the above procedure, more than one authority could make their TQ available for use by other participating UPOV members that use the UPOV TQ for all genera and species.

28. The EAF/19 participants noted that the United Kingdom TQ for sugar beet (see Annex to this document) would be circulated to the participating UPOV members that use the UPOV TQ for all genera and species to see if they would wish to use the United Kingdom TQ or to continue using the generic TQ.

29. A report on progress will be made at future EAF meetings.

VERSION 2.8

Planned release date

30. It is planned to release Version 2.8 of UPOV PRISMA in October 2022.

UPOV member coverage

31. No new participating authorities are anticipated for Version 2.8.

Updating of forms

32. The forms for France and the Netherlands will be updated.

Functionalities

33. The following functionalities are planned to be introduced in Version 2.8:

- Bulk Upload (Maize, United Kingdom);
- Bulk invoice upon request;
- Improve the download functionality for PVP Offices by including UPOV code information for crops not covered by UPOV TG and the addition of following columns (only for United Kingdom as Proof of Concept):
  - Country of Origin
  - NLI Maintainer
  - NLI Agent
  - NLI Applicant
  - PBR Breeder
  - PBR Applicant
  - PBR Agent
  - Date PBR application received
  - Date NL application Received
  - Provisional Marketing Authorization Code
  - Provisional Marketing Authorization Date
  - Seed Weight

PLANNED FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS (AFTER VERSION 2.8)

Registered Users

34. The following requests have been received from users for new functionalities:

- Allow the possibility to upload multiple attachments for the same question;
- In the email notification message, remove the reference to the “applicant” since it is not correct when an agent submits the application data;
- For agents, accept invitations in bulk instead of clicking each one individually;
- Add an additional "notes" field to the agent profile to allow agents to provide further information to breeders/applicants, such as services offered and languages spoken.

35. It is planned to address these requests after Version 2.8 has been implemented.

Coverage

36. The following UPOV members have expressed an interest to join UPOV PRISMA in the future: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Egypt, Japan, Nicaragua, Singapore, United Republic of Tanzania and Uzbekistan. The Office of the Union will consult the UPOV members concerned to discuss their requirements and timeline for joining UPOV PRISMA.

User-friendliness of the tool

37. The following elements would be considered at a later stage to increase the user-friendliness of UPOV PRISMA, according to resources available:

- Addition of non UPOV TQ characteristics in TQ Section 7 instead of TQ Section 5;
- Crop-specific TQs beyond Test Guidelines.

New functionalities

38. The following new functionalities will be considered for possible development:

- Machine translation;
- Information on DUS cooperation.

IT improvements

39. The following IT improvements will be considered for possible development at a later stage and according to resources available:

- Improve the performance of form generation.

UPOV PRISMA SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT TEAM

40. A presentation of the new organization of the UPOV PRISMA support and development team was made at EAF/19 meeting, and will be made at the TWPs.

USE OF UPOV PRISMA (AS OF MARCH 25, 2022)

41. Information on the use of UPOV PRISMA, is provided below:

Number of submissions via UPOV PRISMA

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
January	1		7	18	106	232
February		3	9	5	107	95
March	2	3	6	21	67	
April		3	22	11	105	
May	1	1	32	11	65	
June		7	10	18	821	
July		7	3	9	58	
August		1	7	11	378	
September	3	8	16	29	154	
October	1	19	29	16	68	
November	3	16	26	41	406	
December	3	9	49	31	174	
Total	14	77	216	221	2509	327

42. The TWPs, at their sessions in 2022, will receive an oral report on further developments.

43. The TWPs are invited to note the developments concerning UPOV PRISMA.

[Annex follows]

ANNEX

United Kingdom Technical Questionnaire for Sugar beet (generated from UPOV PRISMA)

Crop/Species

Beta vulgaris L. ssp. vulgaris var. saccharifera Alef. (Sugar Beet)

Authority

GB

IRN

XU_30202200000082

Submission Date

Technical Questionnaire

INFORMATION ON THE BREEDING SCHEME AND PROPAGATION OF THE VARIETY

Do you wish the details and data relating to components of hybrid varieties including data related to their cultivation to be treated as confidential? o Yes • No

If "no", please give information on data relating to the components of hybrid varieties including data related to their cultivation.

Breeding scheme (indicate female component first)

Breeding scheme

The ploidy of both seed-bearing and pollen-shedding components of seed producing crops of sugar beet

- o 1_Diploid without male sterility 2N
- o 2_Male sterile diploid with a male diploid 2N X 2N
- o 3_Male sterile tetraploid with a male diploid 4N X 2N
- o 4_Male sterile diploid with a male tetraploid 2N X 4N
- o 5_Male sterile diploid with a male anisoploid 2N X (2N+4N)
- o 6_Tetraploid without male sterility 4N
- o 7_Diploid and tetraploid without male sterility 2N + 4N

Type of material

- o Inbred line
- o single-cross
- o synthetic
- o other

Origin

- o Seedling
- o Mutation
- o Other

Method of propagation

- o Cuttings
- o In vitro propagation
- o Seed
  - o Self-pollination
  - o Cross-pollination
  - o Hybrid
  - o Other

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE VARIETY TO BE INDICATED

Germity: percentage of monogerm seeds

- o 1_Monogerm (>95%)
- o 2_Partially monogerm/ partly multigerm (<95% and >15%)
- o 3_Multigerm

Ploidy

- o 2_Diploid
- o 4_Tetraploid

Seedling: percentage of seedlings with anthocyanin colouration of hypocotyl

- o 0 – 19%
- o 30 – 39%
- o 40 – 59%
- o 60 – 79%
- o 80 – 100%

Plant: height

- o 1_Very short
- o 2.0
- o 3_Short
- o 4.0
- o 5_Medium
- o 6.0
- o 7_Tall
- o 8.0
- o 9_Very Tall

SIMILAR VARIETIES AND DIFFERENCES FROM THESE VARIETIES

Similar varieties and differences from these varieties

Please note that information on similar varieties may help to identify comparable varieties and can avoid an additional period of testing.

Are there any similar variety(ies) known? Yes/No ● Yes ○ No

Similar varieties and differences from these varieties:

Denomination of similar variety	Characteristic in which the similar variety is different	State of expression of similar variety	State of expression of candidate variety
var			

INFORMATION ON PLANT MATERIAL TO BE EXAMINED OR SUBMITTED FOR EXAMINATION

The expression of a characteristic or several characteristics of a variety may be affected by factors, such as pests and disease, chemical treatment (e.g. growth retardants or pesticides), effects of tissue culture, different rootstocks, scions taken from different growth phases of a tree, etc. Consequently the plant material to be examined should not have undergone any treatment which would affect the expression of the characteristics of the variety, unless the competent authorities allow or request such treatment. If the plant material has undergone such treatment, full details of the treatment must be given. In this respect, please indicate below, to the best of your knowledge, if the plant material to be examined has been subjected to:

Micro-organisms (e.g. virus, bacteria, phytoplasma). Yes/No	○ Yes	● No
Chemical treatment (e.g. growth retardant or pesticide). Yes/No	○ Yes	● No
Tissue culture. Yes/No	○ Yes	● No
Other factors. Yes/No	○ Yes	● No

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WHICH MAY HELP IN THE EXAMINATION OF THE VARIETY

Resistance to pests and diseases. Yes/No	○ Yes	● No
Are there any special conditions for growing the variety or conducting the examination?	○ Yes	● No

Special DUS Tests

If after two years distinctness has not been established please indicate whether special hypocotyl and/or cotyledon tests should be undertaken if a third year of DUS Testing has been agreed.

A fee will be charged for these tests.

Hypocotyl Test	○ Yes	● No
Cotyledon Test	○ Yes	● No
Other information. Yes/No	○ Yes	● No

[End of Annex and of document]