



UPOV/WG-DST/3/6
ORIGINAL: English
DATE: February 5, 2016

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS
Geneva

**WORKING GROUP FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A UPOV DENOMINATION
SIMILARITY SEARCH TOOL**

Third Meeting
Geneva, October 2, 2015

REPORT

*adopted by the Working Group for the Development of a
UPOV Denomination Similarity Search Tool (WG-DST)*

Disclaimer: this document does not represent UPOV policies or guidance

Opening of the meeting

1. The Working Group for the Development of a UPOV Denomination Similarity Search Tool (WG-DST) held its third meeting in Geneva on October 2, 2015, under the Chairmanship of the Vice Secretary-General of UPOV. The list of participants is reproduced in the Annex to this report.
2. The meeting was opened by the Chair, who welcomed the participants in Geneva and those who participated in the meeting by means of electronic conference.

Adoption of the agenda

3. The WG-DST adopted the draft agenda as reproduced in document UPOV/WG-DST/3/1.

Test Study and Possible Use of a UPOV Denomination Search Tool within UPOV

4. The WG-DST considered document UPOV/WG-DST/3/2 "Report of the WG-DST Test Study and possible use of a UPOV denomination similarity search tool within UPOV".
5. The WG-DST noted that the algorithms selected from the first step of the Test Study had produced too many denominations that were above the cut-off value for similarity (low precision). The reason for the low precision was that the number of non-similar denominations identified in the first step of the test study was too small and the types of non-similar denominations too narrow in diversity.
6. The WG-DST agreed as a revised second step, in order to improve the precision of the selected algorithm(s), to run the selected algorithms on the PLUTO database with the 20 test denominations used in the first test study and to produce lists of the denominations above the cut-off value. Members of the Union would then be invited to identify denominations above the cut-off values that were not so similar that they would require further, individual consideration before deciding if they were (sufficiently) different from existing denominations (see Article 20(2) of the 1991 Act and Article 13(2) of the 1978 Act).

7. The WG-DST also received information from Mr. Glenn Mac Stravic that the best algorithms selected by recombination of standard search algorithms could be significantly improved by customization by a suitable expert. Given the long-term benefits of developing the most effective search tool possible, the WG-DST agreed that the Office of the Union should seek to develop a customized algorithm as a further step. It noted that the customization would not be effective unless there was sufficient analysis by denomination experts in the revised second step of the Test Study.

8. The WG-DST agreed on the following timetable for the above exercise as follows:

- (a) Issue a circular to invite CAJ designated persons of the members of the Union by October 6 inviting them to participate in the second step of the Test Study with a deadline of November 4;
- (b) Produce a refined algorithm by December 2; and
- (c) Produce a customized algorithm by December 31, 2015.

9. The WG-DST agreed that the feed-back by users on the customized algorithm should be considered at the fourth meeting of the WG-DST. In that regard, the Office of the Union would invite the members to test the customized algorithm when it became available.

Non-Acceptable Terms

10. The WG-DST considered document UPOV/WG-DST/3/3 "Non-Acceptable Terms".

Botanical names

11. The WG-DST agreed that it would be useful to develop a list of botanical names of genera and, in addition, a list of botanical and common names of genera that have a wider meaning through a survey addressed to members of the Union.

12. In the case of common names, the WG-DST agreed that it would be necessary to restrict the common names, perhaps to those in the GENIE database and for selected crops/species only.

Offensive terms

13. The WG-DST agreed that it would be problematic to develop a list of offensive terms and agreed that this matter should not be considered further.

Comparatives and superlatives

14. The WG-DST agreed that it would be useful to develop a list of comparatives and superlatives on the basis that denominations should not consist of, or contain, comparative or superlative designations (see document UPOV/INF/12 "Explanatory Notes on Variety Denominations under the UPOV Convention" section 2.3.2). Given that the potential list of comparatives and superlatives would be very large, the WG-DST agreed to search for a list of commonly used comparatives and superlatives, in the first instance.

Use of Figures where this is not an Established Practice

15. The WG-DST considered document UPOV/WG-DST/3/3.

16. The WG-DST concluded that it would not be feasible to address "established practice" with regard to the use of denominations consisting solely of figures and noted that this was not a difficult matter for members of the Union to implement.

Content of the PLUTO Database

17. The WG-DST considered document UPOV/WG-DST/3/4 "Content of the PLUTO Database".

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

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

19. The WG-DST agreed, subject to the views of the CAJ, to invite members of the Union to check whether they have relevant variety data that is no longer included in the PLUTO database but was submitted to the PLUTO database previously.

20. The WG-DST agreed that it would be useful to introduce a unique identifier for variety records in the PLUTO database in order that new data submissions would add to the existing data rather than replacing it. In that regard, the WG-DST agreed to invite the CAJ to consider the possible introduction of a unique identifier for the PLUTO database.

Other varieties (new data)

21. The WG-DST noted that there could be relevant data for variety denomination purposes but for which the source was not appropriate for the data to be included in the PLUTO database.

22. The WG-DST noted it would be useful to further consider the development of a common search platform¹ that would search multiple databases containing variety denominations. The WG-DST noted that such an approach might not be as efficient as including all data in the same data form.

23. The WG-DST agreed, subject to the views of the CAJ, to consider whether additional data should be included in PLUTO or accessible via a search platform for independent databases and agreed that it might be appropriate to invite members of the Union to propose data that they would wish to include.

Revision of UPOV/INF/12 "Explanatory Notes on Variety Denomination under the UPOV Convention"

24. The WG-DST considered document WG-DST/3/5 "Revision of UPOV/INF/12 "Explanatory Notes on Variety Denomination under the UPOV Convention".

25. The WG-DST noted that the issues concerning the revision of document UPOV/INF/12 extended beyond the original remit of the WG-DST and noted that the CAJ may need to extend the remit of the WG-DST and the membership.

Date, place and program of the next meeting

26. The WG-DST agreed to hold its fourth meeting in Geneva on February 4, 2016, from 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm.

27. The WG-DST planned to discuss the following items during the fourth meeting:

1. Report of the WG-DST Test study and possible use of a UPOV denomination similarity search tool within UPOV (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
2. Non-acceptable terms (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
3. Date, place and program of the next meeting

[Annex follows]

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

ANNEX

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

I. MEMBERS

AUSTRARIA

Nik HULSE, Senior Examiner, Plant Breeder's Rights Office, IP Australia, 47 Bowes Street, Phillip ACT 2606
(tel.:+61 2 6283 7982, e-mail: nik.hulse@ipaaustralia.gov.au)

[via Webex]

EUROPEAN UNION

Jean MAISON, Deputy Head, Technical Unit, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), CS10121, 49101 Angers CEDEX 02

(tel.: +33 2 4125 6435, fax: +33 2 41 256410, e-mail:maison@cpvo.europa.eu)

[via Webex]

Bénédicte LEGRAND (Ms.), Denomination expert, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), 3, bd Maréchal Foch, B.P. 10121, 49101 Angers

(tel.: + 33 (0)2.41.25.64.50, fax: + 33 (0)2.41.25.64.10, e-mail: legrand@cpvo.europa.eu)

[via Webex]

Carole BONNEAU (Ms.), Database Manager, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), 3 boulevard Maréchal Foch, BP 10121, 49101 Angers CEDEX 02

(tel: +33 2 41 25 64 50, fax: +33 2 41 256410, e-mail: bonneau@cpvo.europa.eu)

[via Webex]

Laura NAIE (Ms.),

Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), 3 boulevard Maréchal Foch, BP 10121, 49101 Angers CEDEX 02

(tel: +33 2 41 25 64 50, fax: +33 2 41 256410, e-mail: naie@cpvo.europa.eu)

[via Webex]

Rudi CAES, Denomination expert, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), 3, bd Maréchal Foch, B.P. 10121, 49101 Angers

(tel.: + 33 (0)2.41.25.64.50, fax: + 33 (0)2.41.25.64.10, e-mail: caes@cpvo.europa.eu)

[via Webex]

FRANCE

Catherine MALATIER (Madame), Denomination expert, Assistant, Instance Nationale des Obtentions Végétales (INOV), 25 rue Georges Morel, CS90024, 49071 Beaucouzé cedex

(e-mail: catherine.malatier@geves.fr)

[via WebEx]

NETHERLANDS

Kees VAN ETTEKOVEN, Head of Variety Testing Department, Naktuinbouw, Sotaweg 22, 2371 GD Roelofarendsveen

(tel: +31 71 332 6128, fax: +31 71 332 6565, e-mail: c.v.ettekoven@naktuinbouw.nl)

[via WebEx]

SPAIN

Luis SALAICES, Jefe del Área del Registro de Variedades, Subdirección general de Medios de Producción Agrícolas y Oficina Española de Variedades Vegetales (MPA y OEVV), Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente (MAGRAMA), C/ Almagro No. 33, planta 7a, 28010 Madrid (tel: +34 91 347 6712, fax: +34 91 347 6703, e-mail: luis.salaices@magrama.es)
[via WebEx]

José Antonio SOBRINO, Jefe del servicio de registro de variedades, Oficina Española de Variedades Vegetales, Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente, Madrid (e-mail: jasobrino@magrama.es)
[via WebEx]

UNITES STATES OF AMERICA

Ernest ALLEN, Director Seed Regulatory and Testing Division
United States Department of Agriculture, 801 Summit Crossing Place, Suite C, Gastonia, NC 28054 (tel.: +1-704-810-8884, fax: +1-704-852-4189, e-mail: Ernest.Allen@ams.usda.gov)
[via Webex]

II. OFFICE OF WIPO

Glenn MAC STRAVIC, Head, Brand Database Section, Global Databases Service

Lili CHEN (Ms.), Software Developer, Brand Database Section, Global Databases Service

III BUREAU

Peter BUTTON, Chair

IV. OFFICE OF UPOV

Peter BUTTON, Vice Secretary-General

Yolanda HUERTA (Ms.), Legal Counsel

Jun KOIDE, Technical/Regional Officer (Asia)

Ariane BESSE (Ms.), Administrative Assistant

[End of Annex and of document]