



UPOV/WG-DST/2/5
ORIGINAL: English
DATE: May 22, 2015

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS
Geneva

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

**Second Session
Geneva, June 9, 2015**

LINGUISTIC ISSUES

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 consider the linguistic issues in relation to the development of a UPOV denomination similarity search tool.
2. The WG-DST is invited to consider whether linguistic issues beyond those addressed in the PLUTO database should be considered in relation to the development of a UPOV denomination similarity search tool.
3. The structure of this document is as follows:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY1
PURPOSE2
BACKGROUND2
LINGUISTIC MATTERS TO CONSIDER3

4. The following abbreviations are used in this document:

CAJ: Administrative and Legal Committee
CAJ-AG: Administrative and Legal Committee Advisory Group
TC: Technical Committee
WG-DST: Working Group for Variety Denomination Search Tool

PURPOSE

5. The purpose of this document is to consider the linguistic issues in relation to the development of a UPOV denomination similarity search tool.

BACKGROUND

6. At its first meeting, held in Geneva, Switzerland, on September 3, 2014, the WG-DST recalled that the CAJ had anticipated that the first step of the WG-DST would be to review the search types currently available in the denomination search tab of the PLUTO database and to review search types in use in other situations that might provide an alternative basis for a UPOV similarity search tool (see document WG-DST/1/4 "Report", paragraph 5).

7. The WG-DST, at its first meeting, agreed that the function of a similarity search tool should be to identify those denominations that were similar to existing denominations to the extent that they would require further, individual consideration before deciding if the denomination was (sufficiently) different from existing denominations (see Article 20(2) of the 1991 Act and Article 13(2) of the 1978 Act) (see document WG-DST/1/4 "Report", paragraph 10).

8. With regard to alphabets, the WG-DST recalled that the situation in PLUTO was as follows (see document CAJ/69/6 Annex I, paragraph 3.1.3, the last sentence, and CAJ/65/13 "Report", paragraph 47);

"3.1.3 (the last sentence) Only characters of the English alphabet may be used."

"47. The CAJ agreed to amend the "Program for Improvements to the Plant Variety Database", as set out in Annex II to document CAJ/65/6, with regard to Section 3.2 "Data quality and completeness" and Section 3.3 "Mandatory items", in order to introduce the possibility for contributors to the Plant Variety Database to provide data in the original alphabet, in addition to the data being provided in Latin alphabet. That amendment was on the basis that:

(a) data in the original alphabet could be provided for the following fields (see Section 3.2 "Data quality and completeness", Table):

- (i) Species: common name (see new TAG <520>);*
- (ii) Denomination (see <550>, <551>, <552>, <553>);*
- (iii) Breeder's reference (see <650>);*
- (iv) Synonym of variety denomination (see <651>);*
- (v) Trade name (see <652>);*
- (vi) Applicant's name (see <750>);*
- (vii) Breeder's name (see <751>);*
- (viii) Maintainer's name (see <752>);*
- (ix) Title holder's name (see <753>);*
- (x) Type of other party (see <760>);*
- (xi) Other relevant information (see <950>); and*
- (xii) Remarks (see <960>); and*

(b) data would not be included in the Plant Variety Database unless all data provided in the original alphabet was also provided in Latin alphabet (see Sections 3.2 and 3.3 "Required data")."

9. In relation to linguistic matters, the WG-DST recalled the situation on transcription, transliteration and translation as set out in document UPOV/INF/12/4, paragraph 5.2(c), as follows:

"(c) Due to different alphabetic scripts or systems of writing, it may be necessary to transliterate or transcribe the submitted denomination to enable its registration in another territory. In such cases, both the variety denomination submitted in the application and its transliteration or transcription are regarded as the same denomination. However, a translation would not be considered as the same denomination."

10. The WG-DST recalled that the situation with regard to accents and characters was as follows (see document CAJ/69/6 "UPOV information databases" Annex I, paragraph 3.1.3):

"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 (~, ^, ", °, etc.) are not accepted. Only characters of the English alphabet may be used."

11. The WG-DST, at its first meeting, agreed that linguistic issues should be considered further at the next meeting (see document WG-DST/1/4 "Report", paragraph 15 to 18).

LINGUISTIC MATTERS TO CONSIDER

12. The WG-DST may wish to consider whether linguistic issues beyond those addressed in the PLUTO database should be considered in relation to the development of a UPOV denomination similarity search tool.

13. The WG-DST is invited to consider whether linguistic issues beyond those addressed in the PLUTO database should be considered in relation to the development of a UPOV denomination similarity search tool.

[End of document]