

Technical Committee**TC/53/31****Fifty-Third Session
Geneva, April 3 to 5, 2017****Original: English
Date: April 5, 2017**

REPORT*adopted by the Technical Committee**Disclaimer: this document does not represent UPOV policies or guidance*Opening of the session

1. The Technical Committee (TC) held its fifty-third session in Geneva from April 3 to 5, 2017. The list of participants is reproduced in Annex I to this report.
2. The session was opened by Mr. Kees van Ettehoven (Netherlands), Chairperson of the TC, who welcomed the participants.
3. The Vice Secretary-General reported that Mr. Jun Koide had left UPOV at the end of his contract on March 31, 2017, and expressed appreciation for the dedicated service that Mr. Koide had provided in his three years in the Office of the Union. He introduced Mr. Tomochika Motomura, a national of Japan, who had started work as Technical/Regional Officer (Asia) on April 3, 2017.

Adoption of the agenda

4. The TC adopted the agenda as presented in document TC/53/1 Rev.

Report on developments in UPOV including relevant matters discussed in the last sessions of the Administrative and Legal Committee, the Consultative Committee and the Council (oral report by the Vice Secretary-General)

5. The TC considered document TC/53/10 and received a presentation by the Vice Secretary-General, a copy of which (in English only) the TC noted would be provided as an addendum to document TC/53/10.
6. The TC noted the developments in UPOV since its fifty-second session that were not presented under specific items on the agenda of its fifty-third session, including relevant matters discussed in the last sessions of the Administrative and Legal Committee (CAJ), the Consultative Committee and the Council as set out in paragraphs 4 to 47 of document TC/53/10.

Organization of the UPOV sessions

7. The TC considered document TC/53/14.
8. The TC agreed that the TC sessions could be organized on a suitable date in the period from late October to early December.
9. The TC agreed to propose that Test Guidelines that could not be prepared in time for adoption by the Technical Committee at its session could be adopted by correspondence on the basis of the recommendations by the TC-EDC. The TC agreed that the TC-EDC should meet twice a year, once in the period March/April and once in conjunction with the TC sessions later in the year.

10. The TC agreed to use the following contingency measures for 2018, subject to the Council deciding that the TC should hold its fifty-fourth session in late 2018:

- (a) For Test Guidelines proposed for adoption in 2018, to use a procedure for adoption by correspondence as follows:
 - Draft Test Guidelines would be prepared as agreed by the TWPs and circulated with the recommendations of the TC-EDC;
 - In the absence of any objections the Test Guidelines would be adopted;
 - In the case of objections, the objections would be referred to the relevant TWP for consideration at their 2018 session, and the Test Guidelines considered for adoption by the TC at its fifty-fourth session, in 2018;
 - TC-EDC to meet on March 26 and 27, 2018, and in conjunction with the TC at its fifty-fourth session, in 2018, if necessary.
- (b) For TGP documents, to invite the TC-EDC to consolidate comments made by the TWPs at their sessions in 2017 and, in the absence of consensus between the TWPs, formulate proposals for further consideration by the TWPs at their sessions in 2018;
- (c) All other matters to be considered at the fifty-fourth session of the TC in 2018 in the normal way.

11. The TC agreed that the scheduling of *ad hoc* Working Group meetings in the period March/April could defeat the purpose of moving to a single set of sessions, because it would require experts to travel to Geneva. However, it agreed that if electronic participation was possible, such as was the case for the EAF meetings, meetings at that time could be an efficient approach.

Progress reports on the work of the Technical Working Parties, including the Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques, and DNA-Profiling in Particular (BMT)

12. The TC received oral reports from the Chairpersons on the work of the Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops (TWA), the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs (TWC), the Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops (TWF), the Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees (TWO), the Technical Working Party for Vegetables (TWV) and the Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques, and DNA-Profiling in Particular (BMT). The Chairpersons provided the following summaries of the work.

Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops

13. The Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops (TWA) held its forty-fifth session in Mexico City, Mexico, from July 11 to 15, 2016, under the chairmanship of Mr. Tanvir Hossain (Australia). The detailed report of the meeting is provided in document TWA/45/25 "Report".

14. The session was attended by 64 participants from 19 members of the Union and 3 observer organizations. The preparatory workshop was held on the afternoon of July 10, 2016, and was attended by 21 participants from 9 members of the Union and 1 observer organization.

15. The TWA was welcomed by Ms. Graciela Ávila Quezada on behalf of H.E. the Minister for Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries and Food, Mr. José Eduardo Calzada Roviroso, and by Mr. Manuel Rafael Villa Issa, Director General, National Service of Seed Inspection and Certification (SNICS). The TWA received a presentation on plant variety protection in Mexico by Mr. Eduardo Padilla Vaca, Director of Plant Varieties Registry (SNICS).

16. The TWA adopted the agenda as presented in document TWA/45/1 Rev.

17. On the revision of document TGP/7 "Development of Test Guidelines", section 4.3 "Drafter's Kit for Test Guidelines", the TWA agreed that the period for Leading Experts to draft Test Guidelines using the web-based TG Template should start shortly after the respective TWP session to avoid any unnecessary delay in finalizing the draft.

18. The TWA considered the proposed guidance for examining DUS in bulk samples, for inclusion as a new section in a future revision of document TGP/8 “Cooperation in Examination”. The TWA agreed with the TWV that the proposed guidance did not present enough examples for examining DUS characteristics on the basis of bulk samples and that the drafter should be requested to further elaborate the proposal including more examples, as requested by the TC, at its fifty-second session. The TWA agreed that further development of guidance on bulk samples should be subject to the availability of appropriate examples with data from routine measurement of characteristics such as chemical content or 1000 seed weight.
19. The TWA received a presentation on “Genotype by Environment Interaction (GEI) - DUS test and data transformation into notes” by an expert from Italy. The TWA agreed on the relevance of the information provided on genotype-by-environment interaction for possible future guidance on converting observations into notes and for producing variety descriptions.
20. On the revision of document TGP/10 “Examining Uniformity”, the TWA received a presentation on “Assessing uniformity by off-types on the basis of more than one growing cycle: drafting guidance” by experts from Germany and the United Kingdom by electronic means. The TWA also received a presentation on “Practical experience of assessing uniformity by off-types on oilseed rape and cauliflower” by an expert from France. The TWA, in conjunction with TWC experts via video link, considered the draft guidance for inclusion in a future revision of document TGP/10, including the new proposed “Approach 3: Combining the results of two growing cycles”. The TWA agreed with the TWC that guidance should provide parameters for decisions on the most suitable approach based on experience from members. The TWA agreed to provide examples comparing the possible effect on uniformity decisions between Approach 3 and other approaches. The TWA welcomed the offers from France, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland and the United Kingdom to provide examples to be presented at its forty-sixth session.
21. The TWA agreed with the TWC on the importance of identifying whether differences in number of off-types between growing cycles were due to biological reasons or sampling variation and agreed that results from growing cycles using different lots of plant material should not be combined. The TWA agreed with the TWV that, in conjunction with the revision of document TGP/10 on “Assessing uniformity by off-types on basis of more than one growing cycle or on the basis of sub-samples”, it would be important to review the guidance provided in document TGP/8: Part II: 8: “The method of uniformity assessment on the basis of off-types”, Section 8.1.7 “Method for more than one single test (year)”, because it did not reflect the practice within members of the Union.
22. Regarding matters concerning variety descriptions, the TWA agreed that the description of a variety had limitations due to its link to the circumstances of the DUS examination but agreed that it was an important element of the plant variety protection system. Australia, the European Union and Germany shared their own experiences on matters concerning variety description through individual presentations.
23. On the number of growing cycles, the TWA received a presentation by an expert from the Netherlands, and welcomed the offers from France, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland and the United Kingdom to simulate the impact of using different numbers of growing cycles on DUS decisions and the quality of variety descriptions using actual data and to report on their results at the TWA at its forty-sixth session.
24. The TWA received a presentation on the “Impact Analysis of Endophytes on the Phenotype of Varieties of *Lolium perenne* and *Festuca arundinacea*” by an expert from the Community Plant Variety Office of the European Union (CPVO). The TWA noted that there had been no interaction between the endophytes studied and expression of the DUS characteristics on the crops studied. The TWA agreed that it would not be possible to make a general recommendation on the effect of endophytes in DUS characteristics due to the possibility of positive interaction between other endophytes and the expression of DUS characteristics. The TWA noted that New Zealand would consider the requirement for endophyte-free plant material for DUS examination and welcomed its offer to make a presentation on the outcome of discussions to the TWA at its session in 2017.
25. The TWA discussed the draft Test Guidelines of Cassava, Urochloa, Barley, Castor Bean, Cotton, Elytrigia, Field Bean, Oats, Quinoa, Red Clover, Scorpion Weed, Soya Bean and Wheat. The TWA agreed that the draft Test Guidelines for Cassava, Scorpion Weed, Urochloa and Wheat should be submitted to the TC for adoption at its fifty-third session, to be held in Geneva from April 3 to 5, 2017.
26. The TWA agreed to further discuss the following draft Test Guidelines at its forty-sixth session: Barley (revision), Castor Bean, Cotton (revision), Elytrigia, Field Bean (revision), Ginseng (revision), Oats (revision), Quinoa, Red Clover (revision), Rice (Revision), Soya Bean (revision) and Tea (revision).

27. At the invitation of Germany, the TWA agreed to hold its forty-sixth session in Hanover, from June 19 to 23, 2017, with the preparatory workshop on June 18, 2017.

28. The TWA agreed to propose to the TC that it recommend to the Council to elect Ms. Cheryl Turnbull (United Kingdom), as the next chairperson of the TWA.

29. The TWA agreed to discuss the following items at its next session:

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Short reports on developments in plant variety protection
 - (a) Reports from members and observers (written reports to be prepared by members and observers)
 - (b) Reports on developments within UPOV (oral report by the Office of the Union)
4. Molecular Techniques (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
5. TGP documents (documents to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
6. Variety denominations (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
7. Information and databases
 - (a) UPOV information databases (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
 - (b) Variety description databases (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union and documents invited)
 - (c) Exchangeable software (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
 - (d) Electronic application systems (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union and documents invited)
8. Uniformity assessment by off-types (documents to be prepared by France, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland and the United Kingdom)
9. Experiences with new types and species
10. Impact of endophytes on DUS characteristics in grasses (documents to be prepared by the European Union, Mexico and New Zealand and documents invited)
11. Regional set of example varieties in Wheat for South America (document to be prepared by Brazil)
12. Number of growing cycles in DUS examination (documents to be prepared by France, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland and the United Kingdom)
13. Minimum distance between varieties (documents to be prepared by the European Union and the Republic of Korea)
14. Use of disease and insect resistance characteristics in DUS examination (documents to be prepared by Australia, Brazil, the European Union and France)
15. Matters to be resolved concerning Test Guidelines adopted by the Technical Committee (if appropriate)
16. Discussion on draft Test Guidelines (Subgroups)
17. Recommendations on draft Test Guidelines
18. Guidance for drafters of Test Guidelines
19. Date and place of the next session
20. Future program
21. Adoption of the Report on the session (if time permits)
22. Closing of the session

30. On July 13, 2016, the TWA visited the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT). The TWA was welcomed by Ms. Isabel Vianey Peña Mendoza, Institutional Relations for Latin America, and received three presentations: "CIMMYT – An overview", presented by Mr. Bram Govaerts, Regional Representative for Latin America; "CIMMYT Global Program for Wheat", presented by Mr. Matthew Reynolds, Distinguished Scientist, Global Program for Wheat; and "Working with the Private Sector", presented by Mr. Arturo Silva Hinojosa, Lead, International Consortium for the Improvement of Maize. The TWA visited CIMMYT's germplasm bank and was welcomed by Mr. Thomas Payne, Head, Genetic Resources Center. The TWA also visited castor bean and quinoa trials at the Autonomous University of Chapingo, and was welcomed by Mr. Agustín López Herrera, Professor Researcher, and Ms. MaríaAntonieta Goytia Jiménez, Director General of Administration.

Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs

31. The Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs (TWC) held its thirty-fourth session in Shanghai, China, from June 7 to 10, 2016, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Adrian Roberts (United Kingdom).
32. The TWC session was attended by 34 participants from 10 members of the Union. The preparatory workshop was held during the afternoon on June 6 and was attended by 8 participants from 5 members of the Union.
33. The TWC was welcomed by Mr. Yang Xiongnian, Director General of Development Center of Science and Technology, Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) (Director General of DUS Testing Station of New Plant Varieties, MOA), Mr. Cai Youming, President, Shanghai Academy of Agricultural Sciences and Mr. Ma Zhiqiang, Division Chief of Variety Management, Bureau of Seed Management, MOA. The TWC received a presentation on the plant variety protection system in China from Mr. Cui Yehan, Professor, Director, Plant Variety Protection Division, Development Center of Science and Technology, MOA.
34. On the afternoon of June 9, 2016, the TWC visited the Zhuanghang Experimental Station of the Shanghai Academy of Agricultural Sciences (SAAS), in Shanghai, receiving presentations and visiting the DUS trials, which included ornamental plants and vegetables.
35. The TWC received an oral report on the fifteenth session of the BMT from Mr. Kees van Ettehoven (Netherlands), Chairperson of the BMT. The TWC also received a presentation by an expert from the Netherlands on bioinformatics (document TWC/34/24 Annex). The TWC agreed that bioinformatics was a field of work closely related to the mandate of the TWC, due to both software and statistic issues that arose. The TWC welcomed offers from China, France and the Netherlands to report on projects and experiences with the use of molecular techniques. Presentations from members were invited for the next session on statistical aspects of using molecular markers in DUS examination.
36. The TWC considered document TWC/34/10 "Revision of document TGP/8: Part II: Section 9: the Combined-Over-Years Uniformity Criterion (COYU)", which reported on progress to improve COYU. The Office of the Union had issued a circular to seek additional data sets to assist the development of probability levels for the new method. An expert of the United Kingdom reported that data sets had since been offered by Denmark and Slovakia. The TWC welcomed offers from China and France to supply data sets. The expert from the United Kingdom agreed to report on progress at the thirty-fifth session of the TWC.
37. The TWC considered a document produced by an expert from France comparing different methods for producing variety descriptions from quantitative characteristics on a common Flax data set (document TWC/34/12, Annex I). The breakdown of the differences and commonalities between the methods provided in this document was useful and the TWC requested that the expert from France continue to develop the study so as to clarify the different methods further. In addition, an expert from the United Kingdom produced a short description of methods used in the United Kingdom, together with example situations when these methods may or may not be used (document TWC/34/12 Add.). The TWC invited experts from France, Germany, Italy and Japan to provide similar descriptions of their methods with a view to future incorporation into guidance.
38. Experts from Finland and Italy gave a joint presentation on "Genotype by Environment Interaction (GEI) - DUS test and data transformation into notes" (document TWC/34/17 Annex). They discussed the impact on variety descriptions produced from quantitative characteristics of genotype-by-environment interaction. The experts suggested measures for ameliorating this issue, such as careful choice of delineating varieties.
39. The TWC discussed the document "Revision of document TGP/10: New Section: Assessing uniformity by off-types on basis of more than one growing cycle or on the basis of sub-samples" (TWC/34/13). The TWC agreed that guidance should be developed to facilitate selection of the most suitable approach for each situation, with the cost of trials, consistency of results, time required for decisions and technical aspects of each approach all having an influence. An expert from France gave a presentation comparing the three approaches on oilseed rape and cauliflower data sets (document TWC/34/27). This exercise showed that cases of diverging results between the three methods were not very common. The TWC thought that further examples would be useful to develop guidance and welcomed offers from Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom to present examples at the thirty-fifth session. The TWC noted that the TWA had agreed to request a video link with experts from the TWC to discuss this topic at the forty-fifth session.

40. There were several presentations on software systems being used or developed by members. These included:

- From the Netherlands, “Naktuinbouw application and information database: Integrated IT-tool to manage applications, requests, trials, reports and variety collections” (document TWC/34/22). This is a core system tailored to local requirements.
- From the Netherlands, “Search Plant: A search portal to facilitate tracking and tracing of ornamental varieties” (document TWC/34/20). This web service allows users to search for varieties over multiple databases with differing architecture.
- From China, “Statistical methods used in the DUSTC software package”. This included a demonstration of the DUSTC software package that incorporates statistical analysis procedures, including the methods for calculating COYU and COYD.
- From China, a demonstration of software for image analysis.
- From France, “A tool to define reference collection” (document TWC/34/28). This software helps to manage the reference collection from the collation of varieties of common knowledge to selection for trials.
- From France, “A single tool for DUS computation process” (document TWC/34/29). Progress on the development of a new software package was described, incorporating the existing GAIA software and using the same interface to give access to methods such as COYD and COYU.

41. The TWC noted the experience of France and Germany in developing, managing and sharing different databases and suggested that guidance on the development and management of databases may be of benefit to members. The TWC invited presentations from members on experiences with using databases and proposals for guidance.

42. China gave a presentation “A ring-test comparing three different software packages for COYD” (document TWC/34/30). COYD was applied to the same data set using different software used by members: DUSTC (China), SAS-based software (Germany) and DUST (United Kingdom). The same result was obtained from all three packages.

43. In respect of document UPOV/INF/22 “Software and equipment used by members of the Union”, the TWC made the following suggestions:

- That a note be added to the document explaining that the information in that document was the responsibility of the contributing authority.
- That reference could be made in both documents UPOV/INF/16 and UPOV/INF/22 to training materials and presentations.
- That an alternative format for the information in UPOV/INF/22, such as an online webpage, be considered to facilitate access.

44. An expert from the United Kingdom gave a presentation on “Calculated thresholds for excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD is used” (document TWC/34/8). This demonstrated a method for selecting similar varieties for comparison after the first growing cycle, based on quantitative characteristics. The method was evaluated on a data set for Pea from the United Kingdom. It was agreed that further data sets would be valuable for developing the method and welcomed the offers from Denmark, Finland, Germany and Slovakia to provide data sets. The TWC noted that software implementing the method would be developed, with a possibility to be integrated into the GAIA software.

45. An expert from Finland gave a presentation on “Minimizing variation between observers – practical example from Finland” (document TWC/34/19). In Finland, steps are taken to minimize variation between observers in the assessment of MS/VS characteristics in turnip rape. Training is conducted prior to beginning of work and calibration is carried out on different occasions during the day.

46. The TWC received a presentation by the expert from Finland on “Number of growing cycles in DUS examination -simulation of impact on DUS decisions” (document TWC/34/15). This study examined whether two or three cycles are needed for the cross-pollinated crops Timothy, Meadow Fescue, Red Clover, White Clover and Turnip Rape. The predominant number of cycles required depended on the crop. An expert from the Netherlands also gave a presentation on “Minimum number of growing cycles” (document TWC/34/21).

This recalled the factors that may determine the number of growing cycles required and suggested that additional tests, such as disease resistance, light sprouting or DNA might be used to reduce the number of cycles required in some cases. The TWC noted that for some members of the Union, DNA tests were being considered for reducing the number of growing cycles while retaining decisions based on a growing trial. An expert of Argentina noted that, in the case of vegetatively propagated and self-pollinated crops, a second growing cycle would not be necessary in cases where distinctness was confirmed with clear differences between varieties (e.g. disease resistance characteristics) in a first growing cycle. The TWC welcomed the offers by France, Germany and the Netherlands to give presentations about simulations demonstrating the impact of using different numbers of growing cycles on DUS decisions at the thirty-fifth session.

47. The TWC agreed that software and databases as well as associated statistical methods were important elements of DUS examination and of increasing relevance to plant variety protection.

48. The TWC agreed to propose to the TC that it recommend to the Council to elect Mr. Christophe Chevalier (France), as the next chairperson of the TWC.

49. The TWC agreed to hold its third-fifth session in Buenos Aires, Argentina, from November 14 to 17, 2017, with the preparatory workshop on November 13, 2017.

50. The TWC planned to discuss the following items during the thirty-fifth session:

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Short reports on developments in plant variety protection
 - a) Reports from members and observers
 - b) Reports on developments within UPOV
4. Variety denominations
5. Matters concerning variety descriptions
6. TGP documents
7. Consideration of possible reorganization of TGP/8
8. Uniformity assessment by off-types
 - a) Practical experience of uniformity by off-types
 - b) Factors influencing the choice of approach for off-types over two or more cycles
9. Molecular techniques
 - a) Selection of similar varieties for maize, rice and wheat using a DNA database
 - b) Use of molecular markers in DUS examination
 - c) Experience in the use of molecular markers in DUS examination
 - d) Statistical issues (bio-informatics) related to the use of molecular markers in DUS examination
10. Number of growing cycles in DUS examination
11. Data Processing for the Assessment of Distinctness and for Producing Variety Descriptions
 - a) Short descriptions
 - b) Review results of practical exercise
 - c) Genotype-by-environment interaction, DUS tests and data transformation into notes
12. Software, information and databases
 - a) UPOV information databases
 - b) Variety description databases
 - c) Exchange and use of software and equipment
 - d) Electronic application systems
 - e) Management of databases
 - i. Experience of members on the application of databases
 - ii. Development of new ideas regarding the management of information
 - iii. Guidance on the management of databases
 - f) A single tool for DUS computation process

13. Statistical methods
 - a) Excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle
 - b) Statistical methods and software for visually observed characteristics
 - c) The Combined-Over-Years Uniformity Criterion (COYU)
14. Image analysis
15. Date and place of the next session
16. Future program
17. Report on the session
18. Closing of the session

Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops

51. The Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops (TWF) held its forty-seventh session in Angers, France, from November 14 to 18, 2016. The session was opened by Mr. Katsumi Yamaguchi (Japan), Chairperson of the TWF.

52. The TWF session was attended by 45 participants from 23 members of the Union and 1 observer organization. The Preparatory Workshop was attended by 21 participants from 16 members of the Union.

53. The TWF was welcomed by Mr. Martin Ekvad, President of the Community Plant Variety Office of the European Union (CPVO) and received a presentation on the plant variety protection system in the European Union by Mr. Ekvad.

54. The TWF considered document TWF/47/19 "Duration of DUS Tests in the Fruit Sector" and the proposal from an expert from the European Union and agreed to propose to modify the wording of document TGP/7 as follows, in order to reflect common practice in the fruit sector (see document TWF/47/25 "Report", paragraphs 47 to 48):

"3.1 Number of Growing Cycles

"The minimum duration of tests should normally be:

"As soon as it can be established with certainty that the outcome of the DUS test will be negative, it can be stopped independently from the number of growing cycles carried out so far."

55. The TWF considered document TWF/47/15 "Number of Growing Cycles in DUS Examination" and received a presentation on the "Number of growing cycles in DUS Examination for fruit species" by an expert from France, a presentation on "Variability of assessment data over years in apple" by an expert from Germany and a presentation on "Interpreting Variety Descriptions for Apple – Environmental influence on Quantitative Characters" by an expert from New Zealand. The TWF agreed on the importance of the variety collections, in order to have reliable data when comparing varieties during DUS examination and agreed that some characteristics are more efficient than others to examine distinctness.

56. The TWF considered document TWF/47/23 "Calibration book for harmonized variety description in apple" and received a presentation from an expert of the European Union. It recognized the use of Test Guidelines as a means of facilitating harmonization among members of UPOV in DUS examination, however it further agreed:

- on the importance, during the Test Guidelines discussion, to agree between experts on the clarity of the states of expression and the scale to be used, in order to limit the risk of discrepancies in interpretation by examiners;
- that each characteristic should fulfill the requirements of a characteristic and this should be kept under review;
- on the need to revise some adopted Test Guidelines and adjust states and notes accordingly;
- on the importance of example varieties allocated to each state;
- on the importance of the method of observation and its explanation, to clarify for the examiners when and where to measure/observe in order to reduce variation between observers/observation;
- on the potential influence of the environment on the expression of the characteristic.

57. The TWF noted illustrated differences in variety descriptions between authorities for the same variety. It further agreed that this information would be interesting to be considered for each characteristic in any future revision of the Test Guidelines, in particular in this case for apple. The TWF agreed on the proposal to study the discriminating power of characteristics on the basis of a model study developed previously by the TWV for peas (see document TWV/47/25 "pea database study"). The study would aim to clarify the use of each characteristic in DUS examination and its ability to describe the variety and/or to assess distinctness in an efficient way.

58. The TWF considered document TWF/47/21 "DUS examination of mutant varieties of apple" and received a presentation by an expert from the European Union. The TWF agreed on the importance of exchanging information among PVP Offices about applications received by members of the Union, especially for some apple mutation groups where similar varieties might be submitted in various countries. Such an exchange would help to allow all relevant varieties of common knowledge to be taken into consideration and, if appropriate, included in the growing trial for the examination of distinctness. It further agreed on the importance of exchanging information about rejected varieties, which might be the subject of ongoing procedures in other members of the Union.

59. The TWF considered document TWF/47/18 "Proposal concerning the "Guide to the UPOV Code System" on the Principal Botanical name for Inter-Generic and Interspecific Hybrids" and considered the proposal to present the principal botanical name for UPOV Codes of hybrid genera and species indicating the parents in alphabetical order. The TWF noted the existence of different procedures among members of the Union and noted that, in some members of the Union, the information on parents of an intergeneric or interspecific hybrid variety were published with the female parent first. On that basis, the TWF agreed with the TWV and TWA 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.

60. The TWF agreed that the following draft Test Guidelines should be submitted to the TC for adoption: Chestnut; Papaya; and Walnut. The TWF agreed to discuss 10 draft Test Guidelines at its forty-eighth session.

61. At the invitation of Canada, the TWF agreed to hold its forty-eighth session in Kelowna, British Columbia, Canada, from September 18 to 22, 2017, with the preparatory workshop on September 17, 2017.

62. The TWF agreed to propose to the TC that it recommend to the Council to elect Mr. Jean Maison (European Union), as the next chairperson of the TWF.

63. The TWF proposed to discuss the following items at its next session:

1. Opening of the Session
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Short reports on developments in plant variety protection
 - (a) Reports from members and observers (written reports to be prepared by members and observers)
 - (b) Reports on developments within UPOV (oral report by the Office of the Union)
4. Molecular Techniques (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
5. TGP documents (documents to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
6. Variety denominations (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
7. Information and databases
 - (a) UPOV information databases (documents to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
 - (b) Variety description databases (documents to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
 - (c) Exchangeable software (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
 - (d) Electronic application systems (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
8. Experiences with new types and species (oral reports invited)
9. Management of variety collections (oral reports invited)
10. Calibration book for harmonized variety description in apple (document to be prepared by the European Union)
11. DUS examination of mutant varieties of apple (document to be prepared by the European Union)

12. Impact of revisions of states of expression of existing characteristics in the revision of Test Guidelines (document to be prepared by France and presentations invited)
13. Minimum distance between varieties (document to be prepared by the European Union)
14. Guidance for drafters of Test Guidelines
15. Matters to be resolved concerning Test Guidelines adopted by the Technical Committee
16. Proposals for partial revision/corrections of Test Guidelines
17. Discussion on draft Test Guidelines (Subgroups)
18. Recommendations on draft Test Guidelines
19. Date and place of the next session
20. Future program
21. Adoption of the Report of the session (if time permits)
22. Closing of the session

64. On the afternoon of November 16, 2016, the TWF visited the Variety and Seed Study and Control Group (GEVES) in Beaucouzé near Angers, where it was welcomed by Ms. Carole Dirwimmer, Manager of Fruit DUS team, GEVES, and received a presentation by Ms. Dirwimmer on the activities of GEVES with regard to DUS in fruit trees in France in general and DUS testing of Apple in particular. Afterwards, the TWF visited the National Institute for Agricultural Research (INRA) in Beaucouzé where, following the discussions on mutant varieties of Apple on Wednesday morning, the TWF saw several Apple mutant varieties of Gala and Fuji in order to demonstrate the difficulties in DUS testing of Apple mutant varieties. During this part of the visit the TWF was accompanied by M. Rémi Guisnel and Laurence Feugey, French Apple Examiners, Horticulture and Seeds Research Institute (*Institut de Recherche en Horticulture et Semence*, IRHS), INRA. The TWF also received presentations by Mr. François Laurens, Deputy Director, IRHS, INRA, on the activities of INRA-IRHS, and by Ms. Dominique Thévenon, Board member, CIOFORA, on minimum distances.

Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees

65. The TWO held its forty-ninth session in Gimcheon City, Republic of Korea, from June 13 to 17, 2016. The session was opened by Mr. Kenji Numaguchi (Japan), Chairman of the TWO. The detailed report is provided in document TWO/49/25.

66. The meeting was attended by 53 participants, from 14 members of the Union and one observer organization. The Preparatory Workshop was held during the afternoon of June 12 and was attended by 28 participants.

67. The TWO was welcomed by Mr. Byeong Seok Oh, Director General, Korea Seed and Variety Service (KSVS), who also introduced the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the Plant Variety Protection System in the Republic of Korea in 2017. The TWO received a presentation on Plant Variety Protection in the Republic of Korea, from Mr. Mookyung Yoon, Division Director, KSVS, who introduced the recent developments on the organization, its mission, history and statistics of the PVP system in the country.

68. The TWO considered document TWO/49/11 "Revision of document TGP/8: Part II: Selected Techniques used in DUS Examination, New Section: Examining DUS in Bulk Samples". The TWO noted the proposed guidance for examining DUS in bulk samples as presented in the Annex to document TWO/49/11, for inclusion in a future revision of document TGP/8. The TWO considered the proposed approach to assess uniformity of individual plants for different varieties to validate the characteristic before being used in DUS examination and agreed that for vegetatively propagated ornamental plants the number of applications per crop would not be sufficient to provide over-years data from many varieties.

69. The TWO noted the reports from members of the Union on experiences with assessing chemical component characteristics and agreed on the technical difficulty and cost implications to obtain a sufficient quantity of certain chemical components to assess uniformity on individual plants. The TWO agreed that characteristics assessed on the basis of bulk samples could provide complementary information for the analysis of distinctness in direct comparison of pairs of varieties for certain crops and agreed that the future guidance should set parameters for selecting among the approaches listed in the Annex to document TWO/49/11.

70. The TWO considered the draft guidance as presented in Annex I of document TWO/49/13 “Revision of document TGP/10: New section: Assessing uniformity by off-types on the basis of more than one growing cycle or on the basis of sub-samples” and agreed that the term “clear” should be clarified in the sentence: “Furthermore, on the basis of a clear lack of uniformity, a variety may be rejected after a single growing cycle”. The TWO agreed to propose that the sentence in approaches 1 and 2 should read as follows:

“Furthermore, if a variety exceeds in the first growing cycle the allowed number of off-types in two growing cycles, the variety may be rejected after a single growing cycle.”

71. The TWO agreed that it should be clarified in the draft guidance whether there was an assumption of assessing two growing cycles using plant material from a single submission by the breeder (e.g. seeds from the same seed lot).

72. The TWO considered a presentation by the Office of the Union on the tutorials for the different user roles of the web-based Test Guidelines template. The TWO agreed that the tutorials should continue to be developed to include additional comments received from users of the web-based TG template. The TWO agreed that the tutorials should be made available on the TG drafter’s web page and a link provided in the web-based TG template webpage. The TWO welcomed Version 1 of the web-based TG template and proposed that the following issues should be addressed:

- to allow immediate visualization of updates made by the Leading Expert in the export file;
- to improve availability online of the tutorials (e.g. link on TG drafter’s web page and web-based TG template);
- to open the Test Guidelines for drafting by Leading Experts as soon as possible after a TWP session;
- to add a shortcut to the print dialog box;
- to enable editing of a comment by an Interested Expert without replacing the text previously drafted;
- to generate a confirmation message when a comment by an Interested Expert had been successfully introduced;
- to improve formatting in TQ 5 to clarify that the applicant has an option to either fill in the RHS Colour Chart number or select to the appropriate color group from the list of color groups in a color characteristics;
- to adjust the standard wording for plant material supplied in the form of corms: “The material is to be supplied in the form of corms able to produce plants to show all the characteristics in the first year of examination.”

73. The TWO considered document TWO/49/20 “Definition of color groups from RHS Colour Charts”. The TWO considered the color names used in the Sixth Edition of the RHS Colour Chart and agreed they did not always reflect the color similarity among different patches. The TWO noted that similar colors in the RHS Colour Chart were grouped under the same UPOV color group and agreed that the current UPOV system was more suitable for variety description purposes. The TWO considered the terms used in color names of the Sixth Edition of the RHS Colour Chart and agreed they were not suitable for use in DUS examination and producing variety descriptions (e.g. “pale”, “moderate”, “vivid”, “brilliant”, “deep”, “strong”).

74. The TWO agreed to use the Sixth Edition as the basis to create a new revised list to replace the current UPOV Color Groups, as presented in document TGP/14 “Glossary of terms used in UPOV documents.” The TWO agreed to request the expert from Germany with support by the experts from Australia, Canada, European Union, the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United Kingdom to draft guidance on the factors to be considered for creating color groups for grouping of varieties and organizing the growing trial (e.g. knowledge on the range of variation within the species and necessary difference between colors for varieties to be considered clearly distinct).

75. The TWO agreed to submit six draft Test Guidelines to the technical Committee for adoption: Abelia; Aglaonema; Dianella (Partial Revision), Freesia (Revision); Lavender (Partial revision); and Petunia (Revision). At its fiftieth session, to be held in 2017, the TWO planned to discuss 16 Test Guidelines, consisting of 2 partial revision, 5 revisions and 9 new Test Guidelines.

76. At the invitation of Canada, the TWO agreed to hold its fiftieth session in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, from September 11 to 15, 2017, with the preparatory workshop on September 10, 2017.

77. The TWO agreed to propose to the TC that it recommend to the Council to elect Mr. Henk de Greef (Netherlands), as the next chairperson of the TWO.

78. The TWO agreed to discuss the following items at its next session:

1. Opening of the Session
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Short reports on developments in plant variety protection
 - (a) Reports from members and observers (written reports to be prepared by members and observers)
 - (b) Reports on developments within UPOV (oral report by the Office of the Union)
4. Molecular Techniques (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
5. TGP documents (documents to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
6. Variety denominations (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
7. Information and databases
 - (a) UPOV information databases (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
 - (b) Variety description databases (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union and documents invited)
 - (c) Exchangeable software (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
 - (d) Electronic application systems (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union and documents invited)
8. Case study on minimum distances between vegetatively reproduced ornamental and fruit varieties (presentation by the European Union and presentations invited)
9. Number of growing cycles in DUS examination (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union and documents invited)
10. Characteristic expression between years or environments for ornamental varieties (documents to be prepared by Australia and New Zealand and documents invited)
11. Report on court cases dealing with technical matters (document to be prepared by the European Union and documents invited)
12. Defining color groups for grouping of varieties and organizing the growing trial (document to be prepared by Germany)
13. Experience with the RHS Colour Chart and possible future addition of colors
14. Guidance on illustrations for pseudo-qualitative characteristics for shape (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
15. Proposal on the principal botanical name for intergeneric and interspecific hybrids and possible effect on the "Guide to the UPOV Code System"
16. Experiences with new types and species (oral reports invited)
17. Matters to be resolved concerning Test Guidelines adopted by the Technical Committee
18. Proposals for partial revision/correction of Test Guidelines
19. Discussion on draft Test Guidelines (Subgroups)
20. Recommendations on draft Test Guidelines
21. Guidance for drafters of Test Guidelines
22. Date and place of the next session
23. Future program
24. Adoption of the Report on the session (if time permits)
25. Closing of the session

79. On the afternoon of June 15, 2016, the TWO visited Gang San Orchids, an orchid breeding and production company located in Busan, Republic of Korea. The TWO was welcomed by Mr. Jae Hwan Soe, CEO, and received a presentation on *Phalaenopsis* breeding at Gang San Orchids, a copy of which is reproduced in Annex IV to document TWO/49/25 Rev. "Revised Report". The TWO received information on the breeding programs and techniques used for the development of new varieties of *Phalaenopsis* that had resulted in 23 protected varieties in the Republic of Korea and abroad.

Technical Working Party for Vegetables

80. The fiftieth Session of the TWV took place from June 27 to July 1, 2016, in Brno, Czech Republic, hosted by the Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture (ÚKZÚZ).
81. The TWV preparatory workshop on June 26, 2016 was attended by 19 participants from 8 members of the Union. The TWV session was attended by 37 participants from 15 members of the Union and 3 observer organizations.
82. The TWV was welcomed by Mr. Daniel Jurečka, General Director, ÚKZÚZ. A presentation on the Section of Plant Production of ÚKZÚZ was made by Mr. Jiří Urban (Director, Plant production section), and on the National Plant Variety Office by Mr. Tomáš Mezlík (Director of the National Plant Variety Office).
83. On the afternoon of June 29, 2016, the TWV visited the ÚKZÚZ testing station in Chrlice, one of the 15 ÚKZÚZ testing stations, which mainly performs DUS and VCU testing of field crops and vegetables. The TWV was welcomed by Mr. Tomáš Jan, Head of the ÚKZÚZ testing station. The TWV visited several DUS trials including cauliflower, gherkin /cucumber, tomato, garlic, onion, pea, pepper and lucerne.
84. The TWV also visited the vegetable breeding company SEMO in Smržice, where it was welcomed by Mr. Jan Prášil, Director, SEMO, Mr. Vladislav Janeček, Vegetable Market Manager, and Mr. Jan Zavadil, pepper and lettuce breeder. At the SEMO premises, the TWV visited breeding trials for various vegetable species and discussed the impact of specific disease resistance characteristics on breeders' efforts during variety development.
85. The TWV considered the revisions of TGP documents. In general, it was not followed by controversial discussion. The TWV discussed the proposed guidance for examining DUS in bulk samples (document TWV/50/11) and highlighted the need to have enough plants to have the full range of expressions of variation within a characteristic and therefore the TWV was not in favor of the approach reducing the number of plants.
86. The TWV received presentations, followed by discussions, under agenda item "New issues arising for DUS examination". The TWV expressed concerns about the speed for making partial revisions of Test Guidelines especially in relation to disease resistance characteristics. The TWV agreed that it would be important to have the opportunity to make proposals for partial revisions in the period after the TC session and before the TWV session.
87. The TWV received presentations on "Minimum number of growing cycles" from France and the Netherlands, followed by discussions. The TWV agreed that the number of growing cycles needed to be considered on a case-by-case basis to design the DUS examination in the most efficient and effective way.
88. The draft Test Guidelines for Agaricus, Leaf Chicory, Witloof Chicory and Lettuce were revised and put forward for adoption by the TC. Partial revisions for disease resistance characteristics in the Test Guidelines for Tomato and a partial revision concerning the coverage of the tomato rootstock Test Guidelines were agreed.
89. For the fifty-first session, the TWV planned to discuss 3 new Test Guidelines, 3 revisions of Test Guidelines, and 8 partial revisions (mainly on disease resistance characteristics).
90. At the invitation of the Netherlands, the TWV agreed to hold its fifty-first session near Roelofarendsveen from July 3 to 7, 2017. The preparatory workshop will take place on July 2, 2017.
91. The TWV proposed to the TC that it recommend to the Council to elect Ms. Romana Bravi (Italy) as the next chairperson of the TWV.
92. The TWV proposed to discuss the following items at its next session:
1. Opening of the Session
 2. Adoption of the agenda
 3. Short reports on developments in plant variety protection
 - (a) Reports from members and observers
 - (b) Reports on developments within UPOV (oral report by the Office of the Union)

4. Molecular Techniques
 - (a) Developments in UPOV (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
 - (b) Presentation on the use of molecular techniques in DUS examination (presentations invited from members of the Union)
5. TGP documents
6. Variety denominations (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
7. Information and databases
 - (a) UPOV information databases (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
 - (b) Variety description databases (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union and documents invited)
 - (c) Exchange and use of software and equipment (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
 - (d) Electronic application systems (document to be prepared by the Office of the Union)
8. Experiences with new types and species (oral reports invited)
9. New issues arising for DUS examination (presentations invited from members of the Union)
10. Matters to be resolved concerning Test Guidelines adopted by the Technical Committee (if appropriate)
11. Discussions on draft Test Guidelines (Subgroups)
12. Recommendations on draft Test Guidelines
13. Guidance for drafters of Test Guidelines
14. Date and place of the next session
15. Future program
16. Report on the session (if time permits)
17. Closing of the session

Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques, and DNA-Profiling in Particular

93. The BMT held its fifteenth session in Moscow, Russian Federation, from May 24 to 27, 2016. The session was opened by Mr. Kees van Ettehoven (Netherlands), Chairperson of the BMT. The BMT was welcomed by Mr. Evgeny V. Gromyko, First Deputy Minister of Agriculture of the Russian Federation, Mr. Vitaly, S. Voloshchenko, Chairman of State Commission of the Russian Federation for Selection Achievements Test and Protection, Mr. Vladimir M. Kosolapov, Head of Department, Plant Production, Protection and Biotechnology, Russian Science Academy, Mr. Igor A. Lobach, President, National Association of Manufacturers of Seeds of Corn and Sunflower, Ms. Ekaterina V. Zhuravleva, Deputy Chief, Department of Cooperation and Support of Organizations in the Field of Agricultural Sciences, Federal Agency of Scientific Organizations, and Mr. Sergey Lupekhin, President, Russian Potato Union. Mr. Peter Button, Vice Secretary-General, UPOV, also made an opening remark.

94. A preparatory workshop was held on May 23, 2016, and attended by 48 participants from 12 members of the Union and 2 observer organizations. The BMT session was attended by 107 participants from 15 members of the Union and 7 observer organizations.

95. The BMT received the following presentations concerning new developments in biochemical and molecular techniques by DUS experts, biochemical and molecular specialists, plant breeders and relevant international organizations:

- The creation of the new group on molecular techniques in the CPVO named "IMODDUS"
- Molecular marker use in the PVP application process in the United States of America
- Evaluation of soybean molecular marker public resources for potential application in Plant Breeders' Rights
- Comparison of genotypic and expression data to determine distinctness among inbred lines of maize for granting Plant Breeders' Rights
- Efficient DUS test in French bean by using molecular data
- Can molecular distance be used as a characteristic?
- Work on molecular techniques in relation to DUS examination of different fruit species

96. The BMT received the following presentations concerning international guidelines on molecular methodologies:

- UPOV and ISO TC 34/SC 16
- DNA-based method for variety testing: ISTA approach

97. The BMT received the following presentations on the use of molecular techniques in variety identification and breeding:

- Application of DNA marker technologies in vegetable breeding
- Gene and genome editing with CRISPR-cas9
- Variety identification of barley using KASP genotypes
- Fast single-step detection and identification of multiple phytopathogens and GMO with real-time PCR-matrix technique
- Laboratory seed control of barley cultivars
- New developments concerning biochemical and molecular techniques in Belarus
- Using of DNA–marker based techniques for varietal identification and fingerprinting of fruit crops and grape genetic resources
- Green forensics: Whole genome sequencing approach for PBR enforcement
- Assessment and classification of breeding accessions of vegetable plants with the use of DNA markers.

98. Cooperation between OECD, UPOV, ISTA and ISO:

- The BMT noted that the development of a joint OECD/UPOV/ISTA document containing an inventory of molecular marker techniques used by crop could only start after agreement by OECD and ISTA;
- The BMT welcomed the proposal by the Netherlands to organize a practical workshop in 2017, with support from UPOV, OECD and ISTA, to explore how molecular techniques might be applied in an efficient way for UPOV, OECD and ISTA purposes;
- The BMT agreed that possible future collaboration between UPOV, OECD and ISTA might include the harmonization of terms and methodologies used for different crops and the possible development of standards, after the agreement by these organizations.

99. The BMT received the following presentations on databases containing molecular data:

- Towards durable DNA databases to support DUS testing
- Advances in the construction and application of DNA fingerprint databases in maize.

100. In response to the invitation by France, the BMT agreed to hold its sixteenth session and a preparatory workshop in France (later confirmed to La Rochelle, France) at the end of September or beginning of October (later changed to November 7 to 10) 2017, with the preparatory workshop to be held the day before the BMT session.

101. The BMT planned to discuss the following items at its sixteenth session:

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Reports on developments in UPOV concerning biochemical and molecular techniques
4. Short presentations on new developments in biochemical and molecular techniques by DUS experts, biochemical and molecular specialists, plant breeders and relevant international organizations
5. Report of work on molecular techniques in relation to DUS examination
6. International guidelines on molecular methodologies
7. Variety description databases
8. Methods for analysis of molecular data
9. The use of molecular techniques in examining essential derivation
10. The use of molecular techniques in variety identification¹
11. Review of document UPOV/INF/17 “Guidelines for DNA-Profiling: Molecular Marker Selection and Database Construction (‘BMT Guidelines’)”
12. Date and place of next session
13. Future program

14. Report of the session (if time permits)
15. Closing of the session

102. The BMT visited the Russian State Agrarian University-Moscow, Agricultural Academy named after K. A. Timiryazev (RGAU-MSHA), and visited the N. I. Vavilov Memorial, where the BMT paid tribute to the great contribution of Mr. Vavilov in a flower offering ceremony.

Matters arising from the Technical Working Parties

103. The TC considered document TC/53/3.

104. The TC noted the report by the TWF that PVP Offices sometimes had difficulty to obtain plant material from breeders, especially when a variety was no longer in commercialization. The TC noted that, in certain cases, the European Union reminded breeders of the need to maintain their varieties to avoid the possibility of the PBR being cancelled. The TC also noted that Australia reminded breeders of the importance of providing material of their varieties for maintaining an effective system of protection. It was recalled that genebanks could be an important source of plant material for seed-propagated varieties.

105. The TC agreed to request the Office of the Union to issue a questionnaire to members of the Union on the approaches used to obtain plant material from breeders, especially when a variety was no longer in commercialization. The questionnaire would also seek information on the approaches used by members of the Union on deciding on varieties whose existence is a matter of common knowledge. The TC agreed that results of the survey should be presented to the TWPs and the TC at their sessions in 2018.

106. The TC noted developments in the Technical Working Parties (TWPs) concerning the following matters reported in document TC/53/3:

- (i) Minimizing variation between observers;
- (ii) Experience with new types and species;
- (iii) Experience with the RHS Colour Chart and possible future addition of colors;
- (iv) Vegetatively propagated varieties in a normally seed propagated species;
- (v) Seed priming;
- (vi) Use of disease and insect resistance characteristics in DUS examination;
- (vii) Impact of endophytes on DUS characteristics in grasses;
- (viii) Calibration book for harmonized variety description in apple;
- (ix) DUS examination of mutant varieties of apple;
- (x) Minimum distance between varieties; and
- (xi) Method of observation for derived characteristics.

TGP documents

Future revisions of TGP documents

TGP/7: Development of Test Guidelines

Revision of document TGP/7: Drafter's Kit for Test Guidelines

107. The TC considered document TC/53/15.

108. The TC agreed the proposed revisions of document TGP/7 "Development of Test Guidelines" to reflect the introduction of the web-based TG template, as set out in document TC/53/15, paragraphs 7 to 11, and agreed that a revised version of document TGP/7 should be presented for adoption by the Council in 2018 on that basis, subject to approval by the CAJ.

109. The TC noted that Annex 4 of document TGP/7: "Collection of approved characteristics" would be superseded by the web-based TG template and agreed that there should be no change to the basis for including characteristics in the collection, i.e. only characteristics which had been included in adopted Test Guidelines after the adoption of document TGP/7 ("approved characteristics") for preparing new Test Guidelines would be searchable.

TGP/8: Trial Design and Techniques Used in the Examination of Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability

110. The TC agreed that the document TGP/8 should provide an introductory paragraph describing the purpose of the document.

Revision of document TGP/8: Part II: Selected Techniques Used in DUS Examination, Section 9: the Combined-Over-Years Uniformity Criterion (COYU)

111. The TC considered document TC/53/16.

112. The TC noted that:

- the Office of the Union had issued UPOV Circular E-16/098 to invite UPOV members' experts to provide to the United Kingdom, by May 27, 2016, data sets including at least 100 candidate varieties, with a possibility that data for those 100 varieties could be derived from several years.
- the TWC had received a report by an expert of the United Kingdom that a data set on red fescue had been submitted by Slovakia and that Denmark had agreed to submit a data set on spring and winter canola later in 2016.
- the TWC had received offers from China and France to submit data sets on maize and fescue, respectively.
- the TWC had agreed to invite the expert from the United Kingdom to report on progress during the thirty-fifth session of the TWC.
- the TWC had noted that COYU was not commonly used for DUS examination of ornamental plants.
- the TWV had received offers by the experts from France and the United Kingdom to provide data on pea and field pea, respectively.
- the TWA had received a report by the expert from Denmark that the software provided by the United Kingdom had been tested and that a data set on oilseed rape varieties would be provided to support the development of probability levels for the new method of calculation of COYU; and
- the expert from the United Kingdom had no new developments to report to the TC and would report on the progress of development of the new method of calculation of COYU to the TWC at its thirty-fifth session.

Revision of document TGP/8: Part II: Selected Techniques used in DUS Examination, New Section: Examining DUS in Bulk Samples

113. The TC considered document TC/53/17.

114. The TC considered the proposed guidance for examining DUS in bulk samples as presented in the Annex to document TC/53/17, for inclusion in a future revision of document TGP/8.

115. The TC recalled that it had agreed the following list of criteria as a basis for the development of future guidance:

- (a) "the characteristic should fulfill the requirements of a characteristic, as set out in the "General Introduction to the Examination of Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability and the Development of Harmonized Descriptions of new Varieties of Plants" (see document TG/1/3, Section 4.2.1);
- (b) "there should be knowledge of the genetic control of the characteristic;

- (c) “the suitability of the characteristic should be validated through an initial assessment of uniformity on individual plants;
- (d) “information on plant-by-plant variation and differences between growing cycles should be provided (data from routine measurement of the characteristic from different years);
- (e) “a full description of the method of assessment should be provided;
- (f) “states of expression should be based on existing variation between varieties considering environmental influence.”

116. The TC endorsed the above guidance and agreed that it would not be feasible to develop further guidance for the time being.

Revision of document TGP/8: Part II: Selected Techniques Used in DUS Examination, New Section: Data Processing for the Assessment of Distinctness and for Producing Variety Descriptions

117. The TC noted the developments reported in document TC/53/18.

118. The TC considered the analysis made by the expert from France in Annex II of document TC/53/18 and agreed to invite the experts from France to check the highlighted values in the table in Annex II, paragraph 6, for possible data inconsistency.

119. The TC agreed that participants in the practical exercise should be invited to provide a short description of their methods to transform measurements into notes and provide examples when these methods might be used, such as for particular characteristics, types of propagation or different situations, on the basis of the short descriptions provide by France and the United Kingdom. The TC agreed to invite the TWC to review the explanations to be provided by the participants in the practical exercise to be considered as a possible basis for guidance for revision of document TGP/8.

TGP/10: Examining Uniformity

Revision of document TGP/10: New section: Assessing Uniformity by Off-Types on the Basis of More than One Growing Cycle or on the Basis of Sub-Samples

120. The TC considered document TC/53/19.

121. The TC noted that presentations had been made by France and the United Kingdom to the TWC, TWV and TWA, at their sessions in 2016, and noted the offers by Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom to provide examples on selecting the most suitable approach for the assessment of off-types to the TWC, at its session in 2017.

122. The TC noted the offers from France, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland and the United Kingdom to provide examples comparing the possible effect on uniformity decisions between Approach 3 and the other approaches to be presented to the TWA, at its forty-sixth session.

123. The TC agreed to invite experts at the TWPs, at their sessions in 2017, to provide information on the criteria for selecting the most suitable approach for the assessment of off-types on different types of crops.

124. The TC considered the draft guidance presented in Annexes I and II of document TC/53/19 as amended by the TWPs, at their sessions in 2016, for inclusion in a future revision of document TGP/10. The TC agreed to invite the TWPs, at their sessions in 2017, to clarify in Annex I whether more general criteria should be considered for a variety to be rejected after a single growing cycle rather than the specific case of having exceeded the allowed number of off types in two growing cycles.

125. The TC agreed that, in conjunction with the revision of document TGP/10, the guidance in document TGP/8/2: Part II: 8: “The method of uniformity assessment on the basis of off-types” should be revised to reflect the practice within members of the Union on the use of methods for more than one single test (year).

New proposals for future revisions of TGP documents

TGP/7: Development of Test Guidelines

(i) Duration of DUS tests in the fruit sector

126. The TC considered document TC/53/5.

127. The TC considered the proposal by the TWF to revise document TGP/7 “Development of Test Guidelines” to introduce new standard wording on the Test Guidelines template and amend Additional Standard Wording 2 to clarify the duration of DUS examination, as follows:

- **Addition of a standard sentence at the point 3 of the UPOV TG Template so that it reads:**

“3. Method of Examination

“3.1 Number of Growing Cycles

“The minimum duration of tests should normally be:

“{ ASW 2 (Chapter 3.1(.1)) – number of growing cycles }

“{ GN 8 (Chapter 3.1.2) – explanation of the growing cycle }

“{ ASW 3 (Chapter 3.1.2) – explanation of the growing cycle }

As soon as it can be established with certainty that the outcome of the DUS test will be negative, it can be stopped independently from the number of growing cycles carried out so far.

- **Additional option(s) to be included in the ASW 2**

ASW 2 (TG Template: Chapter 3.1) – Number of growing cycles

(a) *Single growing cycle*

(b) “The minimum duration of tests should normally typically be a single growing cycle. At the end of the growing cycle the competent authority will determine whether or not a following growing cycle is required.”

(c) *Two independent growing cycles*

“The minimum duration of tests should normally typically be two independent growing cycles. Nevertheless, at the end of each growing cycle the competent authority will determine whether or not a following growing cycle is required.”

128. The TC agreed that it was important to clarify that it was possible to terminate a DUS examination as soon as rejection was inevitable, rather than continuing the examination until the end of the normal period. It agreed that the standard wording in the Test Guidelines was not entirely clear in that respect and should be improved. However, it agreed that the proposed wording could be interpreted as encouraging additional growing cycles beyond the normal period and requested the TWPs to develop an improved version of the text at their sessions in 2017.

(ii) Order of UPOV codes and botanical names

129. The TC agreed that UPOV codes and botanical names in draft Test Guidelines should, in general, be displayed in alphabetical order. However, the TC agreed that the web-based TG Template should allow the Leading Expert to change the order, if appropriate.

(iii) Order of methods of observation

130. The TC agreed that the methods of observation of a characteristic should continue to be presented in alphabetical order, thereby avoiding any indication of order of preference.

(iv) Presentation of different types of example varieties

131. The TC agreed that the guidance in document TGP/7 “Development of Test Guidelines”, GN 28, Section 3.2: “Different types of variety” should be revised in order to indicate that a comma could be used to separate different types of example varieties (e.g. (w) winter type, (s) spring type); and that the indication of

type should precede the denomination of each example variety (e.g. (w) winter 1, (w) winter 2, (s) spring 1, (s) spring 2).

(v) Explanations covering all characteristics

132. The TC considered whether explanations covering all characteristics should be displayed before Chapter 8.1 “Explanations covering several characteristics” without a note in the Table of Chars. The TC agreed to invite the TWPs, at their sessions in 2017, to consider this proposal and report to the TC, at its session in 2018.

(vi) Subsequent explanations covering several characteristics

133. The TC agreed that characteristics with the same explanation could be displayed in Chapter 8.2 “Explanations for individual characteristics” with subsequent explanations being cross-referenced to the first characteristic displaying the appropriate information, as follows:

e.g.: Ad. 10 “[*explanation text/illustration*]”

Ad. 11 “See Ad. 10”

[...]

Ad. 50 “See Ad. 10”

(vii) Characteristics which only apply to certain varieties

134. The TC considered whether to amend document TGP/7, Guidance Note 18(3), to clarify that, in addition to the state of expression of a preceding qualitative characteristic, in some cases the state of expression of a preceding pseudo-qualitative or quantitative characteristic would also determine that a subsequent characteristic was not applicable.

135. The agreed to invite the TWPs, at their sessions in 2017, to consider the possibility and, if appropriate, identify the circumstances under which characteristics could be excluded from observation on the basis of a preceding pseudo-qualitative or quantitative characteristic and agreed to discuss the matter further at the TC, at its session in 2018.

(viii) Procedure for partial revision of UPOV Test Guidelines

136. The TC considered whether to amend document TGP/7 to allow the addition of new proposals for partial revisions of Test Guidelines at any time during the year, subject to the provision of sufficient time for checking of the proposals by relevant experts and UPOV members.

137. The TC noted the role of UPOV for harmonization of Test Guidelines and recalled that UPOV members could amend their own test guidelines before changes were made to UPOV Test Guidelines. However, it recalled that it was important for authorities to report on such developments in order that the UPOV Test Guidelines could be revised, if appropriate.

138. The TC agreed that it would not be appropriate to develop proposals for partial revisions to UPOV Test Guidelines at any time in the course of the year. The TC agreed that Authorities should be invited to notify the use of new characteristics or states expression using the procedure established in document TGP/5, Section 10: “Notification of additional characteristics and states of expression”.

139. The TC agreed to request the Office of the Union to encourage the notification of additional characteristics and states of expression by making a presentation to the TWPs, at their sessions in 2017, on the procedures established in document TGP/5, Section 10.

TGP/14: Glossary of Terms Used in UPOV Documents

(ix) Definition of “recurved”

140. The TC noted that the expert from Israel had withdrawn the proposed revision of the term “recurved”.

(x) Grid for shape characteristics

141. The TC agreed to revise document TGP/14: Section 2: Subsection 2: Shapes and structures to amend the “grid for position of broadest part and width/ratio” presented in Alternative 2, to remove the wording on “ratio” and to display “relative width” in a separate column from the scale of “broad to narrow”, as presented in document TC/53/5, paragraph 30.

(xi) Revision of UPOV Color Groups

142. The TC noted the information from the TWO that some charts of the 1986 Edition and later versions of the RHS Colour Chart had different colors than the same charts in the Sixth Edition that document. The TC endorsed the proposal by the TWO that document TGP/14 “Glossary of terms used in UPOV documents” should be revised to replace the current list of UPOV Color Groups by a new list created on the basis of the Sixth Edition of the RHS Colour Chart.

143. The TC noted the discussions in the TWO on whether the UPOV color groups for the RHS Colour Charts could be used for grouping of varieties and organization of the growing trial and that the TWO had agreed that the difference between UPOV color groups was smaller than would be appropriate for excluding varieties from comparison in a growing trial.

144. The TC noted that the TWO had requested the expert from Germany, with support by the experts from Australia, Canada, European Union, the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, to draft guidance on the factors to be considered for creating color groups for grouping of varieties and organizing the growing trial.

Program for the development of TGP documents

145. The TC agreed the program for the development of TGP documents, as set out in the Annex to document TC/53/5, subject to its conclusions above.

Cooperation in examination

146. The TC considered document TC/53/20 and the oral report by the Office of the Union, which highlighted that:

- 93% of respondents were fairly/very confident of options for cooperation (whilst noting that only 38% of UPOV members had replied)
- 50% of respondents reported that the DUS report is used as the basis for the DUS decision without the need for further information
- 30% of respondents considered that further practical measures might facilitate the use of existing DUS reports
- 29% of respondents found that cooperation in DUS examination was “not at all easy”

147. The Office of the Union reported that the Working Group on a possible International System of Cooperation (WG-ISC) had identified the need to accept DUS reports from any member of the Union without further consideration as a matter for consideration.

148. The TC noted that there were important policy aspects relating to cooperation in DUS examination and agreed that the results of the survey should be reported to the WG-ISC with an explanation of the issues, if requested.

149. The TC agreed that a new survey should be issued in order to increase the number of members of the Union contributing information. The TC agreed that the questions in the previous survey should be used as the basis but the new survey should be shortened by consolidating some of the questions on the basis of the information obtained from the first survey. The TC agreed that the results of the new survey should be presented to the TC at its session in 2018.

150. The TC also agreed that the causes of difficulties in establishing cooperation should be investigated via the new questionnaire.

151. The TC noted the report from Japan on its new administrative procedures to facilitate the exchange of DUS test reports between Japan and other UPOV members, as a result of which, DUS test reports would be provided free of charge for those UPOV members which Japan had a memorandum of cooperation.

Information and databases

UPOV information databases

152. The TC considered document TC/53/6.

GENIE Database

153. The TC noted that a document explaining the data structure and functions of the GENIE database was being developed by the Office of the Union in order to facilitate maintenance and future development. In addition to routine maintenance, a modification of the database was needed for uploading certain type of data when notes applied. Furthermore, improvements to the generation of reports for documents for the Council and relevant committees needed to be made. This work was planned to be completed by 2018.

UPOV code system

154. The TC noted that 173 new UPOV codes had been created in 2016 and that 8,149 UPOV codes were included in the GENIE database.

155. The TC noted that the Office of the Union would 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 document TC/53/6, paragraph 11.

156. The TC considered 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 document TC/53/6, paragraphs 12 to 15. The TC noted the existence of different procedures among members and 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.

157. The TC noted 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

158. The TC noted 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 document TC/53/6. The TC noted that 70% of all UPOV members had contributed data to the PLUTO database in 2016.

159. The TC 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 a subsequent meeting.

160. The TC noted 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.

161. The TC noted that the third meeting of the WG-DEN would be held in Geneva, on April 7, 2017.

Electronic application form

162. The TC noted the developments concerning the UPOV electronic application form as set out in document TC/53/7. The TC noted that Electronic Application Form (EAF) Version 1.0 had been launched in January 2017 (available at: <http://www.upov.int/upoveaf>).

163. The TC noted that the plans for new functionalities and future releases would be discussed at the Ninth Meeting on the Development of an Electronic Application Form (“EAF/9 meeting”), to be held on April 7, 2017, and in particular: the strategy for addition of new crops and species; communication and support plan; proposal for a new name for the EAF; participation in the EAF for Members of the Union; and the tentative timetable for the EAF.

Exchange and use of software and equipment

164. The TC considered document TC/53/8.

165. The TC noted that the Council, at its fiftieth ordinary session, held in Geneva, on October 28, 2016, had adopted document UPOV/INF/16/6 “Exchangeable Software”.

166. The TC noted the deletion of SIVAVE software from document UPOV/INF/16.

167. The TC considered the proposed revision of document UPOV/INF/16/6 to include information on the use of software by members of the Union with information provided by Brazil and Mexico, as set out in Annex I to document TC/53/8.

168. The TC noted that the comments by the TC, at its fifty-third session, concerning the exclusion of software and the use of software by members of the Union, would be reported to the CAJ at its seventy-fourth session, to be held in Geneva in October 2017, and if agreed by the CAJ, a draft of document UPOV/INF/16/7 would be presented for adoption by the Council at its fifty-first ordinary session, to be held on October 26, 2017, on that basis.

169. The TC agreed that the information in document UPOV/INF/16 should be made available in a searchable form on the UPOV website and noted that the Office of the Union would investigate a tool for that purpose.

170. The TC noted that the Council, at its forty-ninth ordinary session, held in Geneva, on October 28, 2016, had adopted document UPOV/INF/22/3 “Software and equipment used by members of the Union”.

171. The TC considered the information in Annex II to document TC/53/8 as a basis for a proposed revision of document UPOV/INF/22/3 and agreed to propose the following changes:

(c) Variety denomination checking (Row: Germany) to read: “Checking of variety denominations in national procedures according to phonetic rules ~~as a supplement to testing~~”

(f) Image analysis to read: “E-mail: a.roberts@bioss.ac.uk”

172. The TC agreed to propose the addition of a disclaimer to document UPOV/INF/22 explaining that the document was intended to provide information on the use of software and equipment by members of the Union and to clarify that that neither UPOV nor the contributing Authority were responsible for the performance of the software or equipment .

173. The TC considered whether the information in document UPOV/INF/22 should be presented in an alternative form (e.g. on-line format) rather than an INF document and agreed that only the existing document UPOV/INF/22 format should be maintained.

174. The TC noted that the proposals of the TC, at its fifty-third session, concerning the revision of document UPOV/INF/22 would be reported to the CAJ at its seventy-fourth session, and if agreed by the CAJ, a draft of document UPOV/INF/22/4 would be presented for adoption by the Council at its fifty-first ordinary session, to be held on October 26, 2017.

Variety description databases

175. The TC considered document TC/53/9.

176. The TC noted the presentations on databases made at the BMT, TWC and TWV at their sessions in 2016, as set out in document TC/53/9, paragraphs 9 to 35.

177. The TC noted that the TWC had invited members to present their experiences in the development of databases, at its thirty-fifth session.

178. The TC noted that the BMT had agreed that facilitating cooperation for the establishment of common databases containing molecular information was an important consideration for UPOV but would need to be initiated between UPOV members in the first instance, as set out in document TC/53/9, paragraph 10.

179. The TC noted the series of challenges for the establishment of common databases containing molecular information and agreed that UPOV might be able to facilitate cooperation in this area by the provision of training and sharing of information.

180. The TC agreed to request the Office of the Union to collect data on existing databases with morphological and/or molecular data. The TC agreed that the information collected should be included in the GENIE database and requested the Office of the Union to plan for the modification of the GENIE database according to available resources. .

181. The TC noted that breeders and academic institutions had extensive experience on the constitution and maintenance of databases and agreed on the value of inviting their contribution to UPOV's work in that regard.

182. The TC agreed that the guidance on plant material provided in document UPOV/TGP/5, Section 1 would be a suitable basis also for molecular data and requested the Office of the Union to propose guidance on confidentiality of molecular information for inclusion in document UPOV/TGP/5, Section 1, on that basis.

Number of growing cycles

183. The TC considered document TC/53/21.

184. The TC considered the presentations made by experts at the TWP sessions in 2016, simulating the impact of using different numbers of growing cycles on DUS decisions using actual data, as set out in the Annexes to document TC/53/21.

185. The TC noted the offers by members of the Union to make presentations to the TWPs, at their sessions in 2017, on the impact of using different numbers of growing cycles on DUS decisions using actual data and agreed to invite the TWPs to report to the TC, at its session in 2018.

186. The TC noted the expression of interest by Authorities to reduce the costs associated with DUS examination and agreed that the number of growing cycles for DUS examination should be the minimum necessary for a robust DUS decision and the establishment of a reliable variety description.

187. The TC agreed that it was not appropriate to generalize that ornamental varieties should be examined in a single growing trial while other types of crops should be examined in two growing cycles and agreed that the typical number of growing cycles should be established on a crop-by-crop basis.

Matters concerning variety descriptions

188. The TC considered document TC/53/22.

189. The TC noted the existence of different elements that could support the identification of plant material, such as the original and other official variety descriptions, including molecular markers. The TC agreed to invite the European Union to elaborate further guidance on the role of the variety description and role of plant material used as the basis for the DUS examination, but incorporating unchanged the text of document TC/53/22, Annex, and also taking into account the following aspects:

- (1) the purpose of the variety description developed at the time of the grant of the breeder's right;
- (2) the status of the original variety description in relation to the verification of the conformity of plant material to a protected variety for enforcement of the breeder's right; and
- (3) the conclusions provided by the expert from the European Union in document TWV/50/14 Add., Annex II, slide 19, as follows:
 - Notes of similar varieties shall come from the same growing trial as for the candidate variety
 - To inform parties concerned on amendments for the Official VD (variety description)
 - Agreement on data supplied to share databases

Development of calculated thresholds for excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD is used

190. The TC considered documents TC/53/23.

191. The TC received a presentation by the experts from the United Kingdom on excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD was used, a copy of which is reproduced in document TC/53/23 Add..

192. The TC noted that further developments on calculated thresholds for excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD was used would be reported to the TWC, at its thirty-fifth session.

Statistical methods for visually observed characteristics

193. The TC considered document TC/53/24.

194. The TC noted that an expert from France would make a report to the TWC, at its thirty-fifth session, to be held in 2017, on the study to develop software to implement the method developed by experts from Denmark and Poland.

195. The TC agreed that the appropriate naming and drafting of guidance on the method developed by experts from Denmark and Poland should be considered once further experience had been acquired and software was available to facilitate its use in DUS examination.

196. The TC noted that China had made a presentation at the thirty-fourth session of the TWC to describe the statistical methods used in the DUSTC software package for the analysis of distinctness and uniformity.

Molecular techniques

197. The TC considered document TC/53/11.

198. The TC noted the report on developments in the TWPs and BMT, as set out in document TC/53/11, paragraphs 5 to 24.

199. The TC noted that the development of a joint document explaining the principal features of the systems of the OECD, UPOV and ISTA could only start after agreement by OECD and ISTA.

200. The TC noted that the development of a joint OECD/UPOV/ISTA document containing an inventory of molecular marker techniques used by crop could only start after agreement by OECD and ISTA.

201. The TC agreed that possible future collaboration between UPOV, OECD and ISTA might include the harmonization of terms and methodologies used for different crops and the possible development of standards, after agreement by those organizations.

202. The TC considered whether to explore circumstances in which the same techniques and information could be used by OECD, ISTA and UPOV, taking into account the different objectives of the organizations, and agreed that the organization by Naktuinbouw of a practical workshop in 2017, in Roelofarendsveen, Netherlands, from May 8 to 10, 2017, could explore such possibilities on the basis of real situations.

203. The TC agreed that UPOV and OECD should consider making progress in the matters above if ISTA was unable to participate in the near future.

204. The TC noted the offer by the Netherlands to report on projects on the use of molecular techniques in DUS examination to the TWC.

205. The TC noted the offer by China to report its experience on the use of DNA databases of maize, rice and wheat when selecting similar varieties for the examination of distinctness to the TWC.

206. The TC noted that the TWC had agreed to invite presentations from members on the statistical aspects of using molecular markers in DUS examination, including the selection of similar varieties and organization of growing trials.

207. The TC noted the offer by France to make a presentation on current work with databases that included molecular information with computation of molecular distances using the GAIA software, to the TWC at its thirty-fifth session.

208. The TC noted that the TWC had agreed that software and databases as well as associated statistical methods were important elements of DUS examination and of increasing relevance to plant variety protection, and the Chairperson of the TWC should report on these particular elements of the work of the TWC to the TC.

209. The TC noted that a Joint OECD/UPOV/ISTA/AOSA Workshop on Biochemical and Molecular Methods had been held in Paris on June 8, 2016, and that the recommendations of the Joint OECD/UPOV/ISTA/AOSA Workshop as reproduced in document TC/53/11, paragraph 25, had been approved by the Annual Meeting of the OECD Seed Schemes, held in Paris on June 9 and 10, 2016.

210. The TC noted that a question and answer concerning the information on the situation in UPOV with regard to the use of molecular techniques for a wider audience, including the public in general, had been adopted by the Council, at its fiftieth session.

211. The TC agreed to propose that the meetings of the BMT be held on an annual basis and that consideration be given to organizing the sessions of the TWC and BMT back-to-back in the same location to facilitate exchange of information.

Discussion session

(a) Use of disease and insect resistance characteristics in DUS examination

212. The TC received the following presentations on the use of disease and insect resistance characteristics in DUS examination (in order of presentation):

Use of disease and insect resistance characteristics in DUS examination	France (Mr. Richard Brand)
Harmonization of resistance tests for DUS testing: "Harmores 2"	European Union (Mr. Sergio Semon)
Resistance-specific molecular markers in DUS testing	Netherlands (Mr. Bert Scholte)
US PVP use of disease reaction characteristics in soybean DUS examination	United States of America (Mr. Paul Zankowski)

(b) Management of variety collections

213. The TC received the following presentations on the management of variety collections (in order of presentation):

How we use molecular techniques in France	France (Ms. Clarisse Leclair)
Variety collections - Harmonized DNA databases	Netherlands (Mr. Bert Scholte)
The management of variety collections by Cyclic Planting of Established Varieties	United Kingdom (Ms. Sally Watson)

(c) *Minimum distance between varieties*

214. The TC received the following presentation on minimum distance between varieties:

Current agriculture is endangered by a decline in genetic distances between plant varieties: Fact or fiction? - Tomato as case study	Netherlands (Mr. Henk Schouten)
--	---------------------------------

215. The TC welcomed the presentation by the Netherlands and noted that a complete report on the study would be published. The TC noted that the Office of the Union would seek to develop a short video on the study by the Netherlands to be made available on the UPOV website.

(d) *Increasing participation of new members of the Union in the work of the TC and TWPs*

216. The TC received the following presentations on the Increasing participation of new members of the Union in the work of the TC and TWPs (in order of presentation):

UPOV – How to increase participation of new Members	Netherlands (Mr. Marien Valstar)
“Intervención de Perú en la sesión del Comité Técnico de la UPOV”	Peru (Mr. Roger Becerra)

217. The TC agreed to invite the Netherlands to draft a paper on increasing participation of new members of the Union in the work of the TC and the TWPs, taking into consideration the survey of UPOV members reported at the fiftieth session of the TC (see: document TC/50/35: “Improving the effectiveness of the Technical Committee, Technical working Parties and the Preparatory Workshops”, available at: http://www.upov.int/edocs/mdocs/upov/en/tc_50/tc_50_35.pdf).

218. The TC agreed that the program for the TWPs at their sessions in 2017 should include an item for presentations to be made by new members of the Union.

Variety denominations

219. The TC considered document TC/53/12.

220. The TC noted developments concerning a possible revision of document UPOV/INF/12 “Explanatory Notes on Variety Denominations under the UPOV Convention”, as set out in document TC/53/12, paragraphs 6 to 11.

221. The TC noted developments concerning a UPOV similarity search tool for variety denomination purposes, as set out in document TC/53/12, paragraphs 13 to 18.

222. The TC noted developments concerning the possible expansion of the content of the PLUTO Database, as set out in document TC/53/12, paragraphs 19 to 23.

223. The TC noted developments concerning non-acceptable terms, as set out in document TC/53/12, paragraphs 24 to 28.

224. The TC noted that the third meeting of the WG-DEN would be held in Geneva, on April 7, 2017.

225. The TC noted the draft agenda of the third meeting of the WG-DEN, as set out in document TC/53/12, paragraph 30.

226. The European Union recalled the importance of comparing results of the new algorithm with other existing algorithms and ensure that it would provide an improvement in terms of precision and recall and highlighted the need to address “false negatives” and treatment of data, such as double letters.

Preparatory workshops

227. The TC considered document TC/53/13.

228. The TC noted the report of the preparatory workshops held in 2016.

229. The TC considered the proposed program for preparatory workshops for 2017, as set out in document TC/53/13, paragraphs 12 to 14, and agreed that the preparatory workshops in 2017 should demonstrate how to use the web-based TG template and should include an item on the use of molecular techniques in DUS examination.

230. The TC noted that the TWPs would meet twice before the 2018 session of the TC, which could result in a reduction of the number of matters to be discussed. The TC agreed that the preparatory workshops 2018 should be organized on the Monday/Tuesday of the TWPs session to encourage participation by all TWP participants.

231. The TC agreed that the exercises for the preparatory workshops should be renewed and invited members of the Union to provide suggestions on particular aspects of interest to be covered in the exercises.

Web-based Test Guidelines template

232. The TC considered document TC/53/29.

233. The TC noted the comments by the TWPs, at their sessions in 2016, as presented in document TC/53/29, paragraphs 7 to 17.

234. The TC noted that the following items had been resolved in Version 1.0 of the web-based TG template:

- immediate visualization of updates made by the Leading Expert in the export file;
- online availability of tutorials (web-based TG template webpage);
- editing of comments by Interested Experts without replacing previously drafted text;
- confirmation message after successful introduction of comments by Interested Experts;
- addition of a free text box for wording on “form of plant material to be supplied” (e.g. “The material is to be supplied in the form of corms able to produce plants to show all the characteristics in the first year of examination.”)

235. The TC noted that a general revision of the software code was underway to eliminate remaining reported malfunctioning issues and to stabilize the system. The TC noted that the Office of the Union had introduced a translator’s interface for the generation of versions of Test Guidelines in the official UPOV languages but that further development of the interface would be needed before it could be used efficiently by the translators.

236. The TC recalled that the development of Version 2 of the web-based TG Template would not start before 2018, subject to availability of resources, after Version 1 had been fully stabilized and tested.

237. The TC noted that the following issues would be considered for inclusion in Version 2 of the web-based TG Template, as set out in document TC/53/29, paragraphs 21 and 22:

- Addition of hyperlinks in the exported documents to the symbols indicating that a characteristic has explanations covering individual and/or several characteristics in the Table of Characteristics in order to facilitate electronic navigation in the document;
- Possibility to display large tables in landscape format, such as for indication of growth types;
- Provide the comments by the Office of the Union on draft Test Guidelines in the web-based TG Template.

238. Subject to the completion of discussions on proposed amendments to document TGP/7 “Development of Test Guidelines”, further changes would need to be introduced in the web-based TG Template (see document TC/53/5 “TGP documents”).

239. The TC agreed that training on the use of the web-based TG template should be offered to the TWPs during the preparatory workshops of the session and/or during the discussions on the agenda item “guidance for drafters’ of Test Guidelines”. The TC agreed that training should also include FAQs and tutorials for users of the web-based TG template.

List of genera and species for which authorities have practical experience in the examination of distinctness, uniformity and stability

240. The TC considered document TC/53/4 and noted that the number of taxa for which members of the Union had indicated their practical experience in the examination of DUS had increased from 3,462 in 2016 to 3,561 in 2017 (+ 2.9%). The number of genera and species for which members of the Union had indicated their practical experience in the examination of DUS had increased to 3,416. Information on members of the Union with practical experience in DUS examination is freely accessible via the GENIE database.

Test Guidelines

241. The TC considered documents TC/53/2, TC/53/25, TC/53/26, TC/53/27, TC/53/28 and TC/53/30 Rev.

242. According to the procedures established in document TGP/7, the TC adopted 5 new Test Guidelines for the Conduct of Tests for Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability, 9 revised Test Guidelines and 4 partially revised Test Guidelines, as listed in the table below, on the basis of the amendments specified in Annex II to this document and the linguistic changes recommended by the TC-EDC and agreed that they should be published on the UPOV website at the earliest opportunity:

**	TWP	Document No. No. du document Dokument-Nr. No del documento	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Botanical name
<u>NEW TEST GUIDELINES / NOUVEAUX PRINCIPES DIRECTEURS D'EXAMEN / NEUE PRÜFUNGSRICHTILINIEN / NUEVAS DIRECTRICES DE EXAMEN</u>							
FR	TWO	TG/ABELI(proj.6)	Abelia	Abelia	Abelia	Abelia	Abelia R. Br.
JP	TWO	TG/AGLAO(proj.9)	Chinese Evergreen	Aglaonema	Aglaonema	Aglaonema	Aglaonema Schott.
KE/ BR	TWA/ TWV	TG/CASSAV(proj.8)	Cassava	Manioc	Maniok	Mandioca, Yuca	Manihot esculenta Crantz
PL	TWA	TG/PHACE(proj.6)	Scorpion Weed	Phacélie à feuilles de tanaïsie	Phazelie	Phazelia	Phacelia tanacetifolia Benth.

**	TWP	Document No. No. du document Dokument-Nr. No del documento	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Botanical name
BR	TWA	TG/UROCH(proj.11)	Bread Grass, Palisade Grass, Palisade Signal Grass, Signal Grass; Basilisk Signal Grass, Signal Grass, Spreading Liverseed Grass, Surinam Grass; Creeping Signal Grass, Koronivia Grass; Congo Grass, Congo Signal Grass, Ruzi Grass	Signal; Koronivia;	Palisadengras; Surinamgras;	Pasto alambre, Pasto señal, Zacate señal, Zacate signal; Zacate Surinam, Pasto chontalpo, Pasto de la palizada, Pasto de las orillas, Pasto peludo, Pasto prodigio, Zacate prodigio; Braquiaria dulce, Kikuyu de la Amazonia, Pasto humidicola, Pasto humidicola dulce; Congo señal, Gambutera, Kenia, Pasto Congo, Pasto ruzi	Urochloa brizantha (Hochst. ex A. Rich.) R. D. Webster (Brachiaria brizantha (Hochst. ex A. Rich.) Stapf); Urochloa decumbens (Stapf) R. D. Webster (Brachiaria decumbens Stapf); Urochloa dictyoneura (Fig. & De Not.) Veldkamp P. (Brachiaria dictyoneura (Fig. & De Not.) Veldkamp P.); Urochloa humidicola (Rendle) Morrone & Zuloaga (Brachiaria humidicola (Rendle) Schweick.); Urochloa ruzi ensis (R. Germ. & C. M. Evrard) Morrone & Zuloaga (Brachiaria ruzizensis R. Germ. & C. M. Evrard)
REVISIONS OF TEST GUIDELINES / RÉVISIONS DE PRINCIPES DIRECTEURS D'EXAMEN ADOPTÉS / REVISIONEN ANGENOMMENER PRÜFUNGSRICHTLINIEN / REVISIONES DE DIRECTRICES DE EXAMEN ADOPTADAS							
FR	TWA	TG/3/12(proj.7)	Wheat	Blé	Weizen	Trigo	Triticum aestivum L.
NL	TWV	TG/13/11(proj.5)	Lettuce	Laitue	Salat	Lechuga	Lactuca sativa L.
NL	TWO	TG/27/7(proj.5)	Freesia	Freesia	Freesie	Fresia	Freesia Eckl. ex Klatt
JP	TWF	TG/124/4(proj.5)	Chestnut	Châtaignier	Kastanie	Castaño	Castanea sativa Mill.
CN	TWF	TG/125/7(proj.5)	Walnut	Noyer	Walnuß	Nogal	Juglans regia L.
IT	TWV	TG/154/4(proj.6)	Leaf Chicory	Chicorée à feuille (sauvage)	Blattzichorie	Achicoria de hoja	Cichorium intybus L. var. foliosum Hegi
FR	TWV	TG/173/4(proj.6)	Witloof, Chicory	Chicorée, Endive	Chicorée	Endivia	Cichorium intybus L. partim
DE	TWO	TG/212/2(proj.5)	Petunia	Pétunia	Petunie	Petunia	Petunia Juss.; xPetchoa J. M. H. Shaw
MX	TWF	TG/264/2(proj.9)	Papaya, Pawpaw	Papayer	Melonenbaum, Papaya	Papayo, Lechosa	Carica papaya L.

**	TWP	Document No. No. du document Dokument-Nr. No del documento	English	Français	Deutsch	Español	Botanical name
<u>PARTIAL REVISIONS OF TEST GUIDELINES / RÉVISIONS PARTIELLES DE PRINCIPES DIRECTEURS D'EXAMEN ADOPTÉS / TEILREVISIONEN ANGENOMMENER PRÜFUNGSRICHTLINIEN / REVISIONES PARCIALES DE DIRECTRICES DE EXAMEN ADOPTADAS</u>							
QZ	TWV	TG/44/11 Rev. and document TC/53/27	Tomato	Tomate	Tomate	Tomate	Solanum lycopersicum (L.) Karst. ex. Farw.
FR	TWO	TG/194/1 and document TC/53/26	Lavendula, Lavendar	Lavande vraie, Lavandins	Echter Lavendel, Lavendel	Lavándula, Lavenda	Lavandula L.
AU	TWO	TG/288/1 Rev. and document TC/53/25	Flax-lily, Dianella	Dianella	Flachslilie, Dianella	Dianella	Dianella Lam. ex Juss.
ES	TWV	TG/294/1 Corr. Rev.2 and document TC/53/28	Tomato Rootstocks	Porte-greffe de tomate	Tomatenunterlagen	Portainjertos de tomate	Solanum lycopersicum L. x Solanum habrochaites S. Knapp & D.M. Spooner; Solanum lycopersicum L. x Solanum peruvianum (L.) Mill.; Solanum lycopersicum L. x Solanum cheesmaniae (L. Ridley) Fosberg

243. With regard to the draft Test Guidelines for Agaricus (document TG/259/2(proj.4)), on the basis of the recommendation of the TC-EDC, the TC agreed that the technical issues concerning those draft Test Guidelines, as set out in Annex II to this document, should be referred back to the TWV for further consideration.

Corrections to Test Guidelines

244. The TC noted that corrected versions of the Test Guidelines for Camellia (document TG/275/1 Corr.) and for Cucumber, Gherkin (document TG/61/7 Rev.2 Corr.) were posted on the UPOV website, as set out in document TC/53/30 Rev.

245. The TC noted that corrected versions of the Test Guidelines for Acca (document TG/306/1), Avocado Rootstocks (document TG/318/1), Japanese Plum (document TG/84/4 Corr.), Radish; Black Radish (document TG/63/7-TG/64/7 Rev.), and Mango (document TG/112/4) would be posted on the UPOV website after the TC session, as set out in document TC/53/30 Rev.

Draft Test Guidelines discussed by the Technical Working Parties in 2016

246. The TC noted the draft Test Guidelines discussed by the TWPs at their sessions in 2016, as listed in document TC/53/2, Annex II.

Draft Test Guidelines to be discussed by the Technical Working Parties in 2017

247. The TC agreed the program for the development of new Test Guidelines and for the revision of Test Guidelines, as shown in document TC/53/2, Annex III. The TC agreed that a revised version of document TC/53/2 should be published to include the Test Guidelines for Barley, Field Bean, Oats, Pea, Red Clover and Rice in Annex III.

Status of existing Test Guidelines or draft Test Guidelines

248. The TC noted the status of the existing Test Guidelines, as listed in document TC/53/2, Annex IV.

Superseded Test Guidelines

249. The TC noted the list of superseded Test Guidelines, as presented in Annex V to document TC/53/2, and noted that the superseded versions of Test Guidelines were available on the Test Guidelines page of the UPOV website.

Date of publication of Test Guidelines on the UPOV website

250. The TC noted that the Test Guidelines page of the UPOV website has been modified to display information on date of adoption and date of publication of Test Guidelines.

Additional characteristics

251. The TC noted that no notifications of additional characteristics or states of expression were notified to the Office of the Union since the fifty second session of the Technical Committee.

Procedure for addressing additional information required by the TC-EDC

252. The TC endorsed the recommendation by the TC-EDC, at its meeting in April 2017, to refer comments on Test Guidelines to Leading Experts and the TWPs in parallel to address issues requiring additional information. The TC also agreed to consider this approach at its session in 2018 and whether it should be included in document TGP/7.

Revision of document TGP/14: illustrations for shape and ratio characteristics

253. The TC endorsed the recommendation by the TC-EDC, at its meeting in April 2017, to improve guidance available in document TGP/14 on providing illustrations for shape and ratio characteristics by the inclusion of additional examples. The TC agreed to invite the TWPs, at their sessions in 2017, to consider the issue and report to the TC at its session in 2018.

Program for the development of new Test Guidelines and for the revision of Test Guidelines in 2018

254. As an additional contingency measure, the TC agreed that the program for the development of new Test Guidelines and for the revision of Test Guidelines in 2018 should be approved by the TC by correspondence on an exceptional basis.

Chairpersons

255. The TC agreed to recommend to the Council the election of the next chairpersons of the TWPs as follows:

<u>TWP</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
BMT	Mr. Nik Hulse (Australia)
TWA	Ms. Cheryl Turnbull (United Kingdom)
TWC	Mr. Christophe Chevalier (France)
TWF	Mr. Jean Maison (European Union)
TWO	Mr. Henk de Greef (Netherlands)
TWV	Ms. Romana Bravi (Italy)

Program for the fifty-fourth session

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Report on developments in UPOV including relevant matters discussed in the last sessions of the Administrative and Legal Committee, the Consultative Committee and the Council
4. Organization of the UPOV sessions
5. Progress reports on the work of the Technical Working Parties, including the Working Group on Biochemical and Molecular Techniques, and DNA-Profiling in Particular (BMT)
6. Matters arising from the Technical Working Parties
7. TGP documents
8. Cooperation in examination
9. Information and databases
 - (a) UPOV information databases
 - (b) Electronic application form
 - (c) Exchange and use of software and equipment
 - (d) Variety description databases
10. Number of growing cycles
11. Matters concerning variety descriptions
12. Development of calculated thresholds for excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD is used
13. Statistical methods for visually observed characteristics
14. Discussion on:
 - (a) Minimum distances between varieties
 - (b) Increasing participation of new members of the Union in the work of the TC and the TWPs (including the provision of training on using UPOV tools to new members of the Union)
15. Molecular techniques
16. Variety denominations
17. Preparatory workshops
18. List of genera and species for which authorities have practical experience in the examination of distinctness, uniformity and stability
19. Web-based Test Guidelines template
20. Test Guidelines
21. Program for the fifty-fifth session
22. Adoption of the report (if time permits)
23. Closing of the session

256. The TC adopted this report at the close of its session on April 5, 2017.

[Annexes follow]

ANNEXE I / ANNEX I / ANLAGE I / ANEXO I

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS / LIST OF PARTICIPANTS /
TEILNEHMERLISTE / LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

(dans l'ordre alphabétique des noms français des membres /
in the alphabetical order of the French names of the Members /
in alphabetischer Reihenfolge der französischen Namen der Mitglieder /
por orden alfabético de los nombres en francés de los miembros)

I. MEMBRES / MEMBERS / VERBANDSMITGLIEDER / MIEMBROSALLEMAGNE / GERMANY / DEUTSCHLAND / ALEMANIA

Beate RÜCKER (Ms.), Head of Departement, Bundessortenamt, Hanover
(e-mail: beate.ruecker@bundessortenamt.de)

Swenja TAMS (Ms), Head of Section General affairs of DUS testing, Bundessortenamt, Hanover
(e-mail: Swenja.Tams@bundessortenamt.de)

ARGENTINE / ARGENTINA / ARGENTINIEN / ARGENTINA

Raimundo LAVIGNOLLE, Presidente del Directorio, Instituto Nacional de Semillas (INASE),
Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería y Pesca, Ministerio de Economía, Buenos Aires
(e-mail: rlavignolle@inase.gov.ar)

María Laura VILLAMAYOR (Sra.), Abogada, Unidad Presidencia, Instituto Nacional de Semillas (INASE),
Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería y Pesca, Ministerio de Economía, Buenos Aires
(e-mail: mlvillamayor@inase.gov.ar)

AUSTRALIE / AUSTRALIA / AUSTRALIEN / AUSTRALIA

Nik HULSE, Chief of Plant Breeders' Rights, Plant Breeder's Rights Office, IP Australia, Woden
(e-mail: nik.hulse@ipaaustralia.gov.au)

Tanvir HOSSAIN, Senior Examiner, Plant Breeder's Rights Office, IP Australia, Woden
(e-mail: tanvir.hossain@ipaaustralia.gov.au)

AUTRICHE / AUSTRIA / ÖSTERREICH / AUSTRIA

Barbara FÜRNWEGER (Frau), Leiterin, Abteilung Sortenschutz und Registerprüfung, Institut für Saat- und
Pflanzgut, Pflanzenschutzdienst und Bienen, Österreichische Agentur für Gesundheit und
Ernährungssicherheit GmbH, Wien
(e-mail: barbara.fuernweger@ages.at)

BÉLARUS / BELARUS / BELARUS / BELARÚS

Uladzimir BEINIA, Director, State Inspection for Testing and Protection of Plant Varieties, Minsk
(e-mail: belsort@mail.ru)

Tatsiana SIAMASHKA (Mrs.), Deputy Director of DUS Testing, State Inspection for Testing and Protection of
Plant Varieties, Minsk
(e-mail: tatianasotr@mail.ru)

Maryna SALADUKHA (Ms.), Head, International Cooperation Department, State Inspection for Testing and
Protection of Plant Varieties, Minsk
(e-mail: belsort@mail.ru)

BOLIVIE (ÉTAT PLURINATIONAL DE) / BOLIVIA (PLURINATIONAL STATE OF) /
BOLIVIEN (PLURINATIONALER STAAT) / BOLIVIA (ESTADO PLURINACIONAL DE)

Luis Fernando ROSALES LOZADA, Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra
(e-mail: fernando.rosales@mission-bolivia.ch)

BRÉSIL / BRAZIL / BRASILIEN / BRASIL

Ricardo ZANATTA MACHADO, Fiscal Federal Agropecuário, Coordenador do SNPC, Serviço Nacional de
Proteção de Cultivares (SNPC), Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento, Brasília, D.F.
(e-mail: ricardo.machado@agricultura.gov.br)

Cauê DE OLIVEIRA FANHA, Diplomate, Permanent Mission of Brazil, Geneva
(e-mail: caue.fanha@itamaraty.gov.br)

CANADA / CANADA / KANADA / CANADÁ

Anthony PARKER, Commissioner, Plant Breeders' Rights Office, Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA), Ottawa
(e-mail: anthony.parker@inspection.gc.ca)

Marc DE WIT, Examiner, Plant Breeders' Rights Office, Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA), Ottawa
(e-mail: Marc.deWit@inspection.gc.ca)

CHILI / CHILE / CHILE / CHILE

Natalia SOTOMAYOR CABRERA (Sra.), Abogado, Departamento de Asesoría Jurídica, Oficina de Estudios y Políticas Agrarias (ODEPA), Santiago de Chile
(e-mail: nsotomayor@odepa.gob.cl)

Alvaro ULLOA, Encargado Área Frutales, Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero, Ministerio de Agricultura, Santiago de Chile
(e-mail: alvaro.ulloa@sag.gob.cl)

Marcela PAIVA VÉLIZ (Ms.), Counselor, Misión Permanente de Chile, Ginebra
(e-mail: mpaiva@minrel.gov.cl)

CHINE / CHINA / CHINA / CHINA

Wenjun CHEN, Project Officer, State Intellectual Property Office, Beijing
(e-mail: chenwenjun@sipo.gov.cn)

Chao DENG, Principal Staff Member, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture, Beijing
(e-mail: dengchaowin@sina.com)

Faji HUANG, Officer, Office for the Protection of New Plant Varieties, State Forestry Administration, Beijing
(e-mail: huangfaji@sina.com)

COLOMBIE / COLOMBIA / KOLUMBIEN / COLOMBIA

Ana Luisa DÍAZ JIMÉNEZ (Sra.), Directora, Dirección Técnica de Semillas, Instituto Colombiano Agropecuario (ICA), Bogotá D.C.
(e-mail: analuisadiazj@gmail.com)

Juan Camilo SARETZKI-FORERO, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra
(e-mail: juan.saretzki@misioncolombia.ch)

DANEMARK / DENMARK / DÅNEMARK / DINAMARCA

Gerhard DENEKEN, Director, Tystofte Foundation, Skaelskoer
(e-mail: gde@tystofte.dk)

ESPAGNE / SPAIN / SPANIEN / ESPAÑA

José Luis ALONSO PRADOS, Director Técnico, Dirección Técnica de Evaluación de Variedades y Productos Fitosanitarios (DTEVPF), INIA, Madrid
(e-mail: prados@inia.es)

ESTONIE / ESTONIA / ESTLAND / ESTONIA

Laima PUUR (Ms.), Head, Variety Department, Estonian Agricultural Board, Viljandi
(e-mail: laima.puur@pma.agri.ee)

Kristiina DIGRYTE (Ms.), Adviser, Plant Health Department, Tallinn
(e-mail: kristiina.digryte@agri.ee)

Renata TSATURJAN (Ms.), Chief Specialist, Plant Production Bureau, Ministry of Rural Affairs, Tallinn
(e-mail: renata.tsaturjan@agri.ee)

ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE / UNITED STATES OF AMERICA / VEREINIGTE STAATEN VON AMERIKA / ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA

Kitisri SUKHAPINDA (Ms.), Patent Attorney, Office of Policy and International Affairs, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Alexandria
(e-mail: kitisri.sukhapinda@uspto.gov)

Elaine WU (Ms.), Attorney - Advisor, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria
(e-mail: elaine.wu@uspto.gov)

Ruihong GUO (Ms.), Deputy Administrator, AMS, Science & Technology Program, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Washington D.C.
(e-mail: ruihong.guo@ams.usda.gov)

Paul M. ZANKOWSKI, Commissioner, Plant Variety Protection Office, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), AMS, S&T, Washington D.C.
(e-mail: paul.zankowski@ams.usda.gov)
[via WebEx]

FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE / RUSSIAN FEDERATION / RUSSISCHE FÖDERATION / FEDERACIÓN DE RUSIA

Ismail MERZHOEV, Deputy Chairman, State Commission of the Russian Federation for Selection Achievements Test and Protection, Moscow
(e-mail: dicm@gossort.com)

Yury A. ROGOVSKIY, Head, Methodology and International Cooperation Department, Candidate of Agricultural Sciences, State Commission of the Russian Federation for Selection Achievements Test and Protection, Moscow
(e-mail: yrogovskij@yandex.ru)

Nataliya NOVOSELOVA (Ms.), Deputy Head, Methodology and International Relations Department, State Commission of the Russian Federation for Selection Achievements Test and Protection, Moscow
(e-mail: dicm@gossort.com)

FRANCE / FRANCE / FRANKREICH / FRANCIA

Richard BRAND, DUS Coordination, Groupe d'étude et de contrôle des variétés et des semences (GEVES), Le Thor
(e-mail: richard.brand@geves.fr)

Clarisse LECLAIR (Mme), General affairs of DUS testing, Groupe d'étude et de contrôle des variétés et des semences (GEVES), Beaucauzé
(e-mail: clarisse.leclair@geves.fr)

IRLANDE / IRELAND / IRLAND / IRLANDA

Donal COLEMAN, Controller of Plant Breeders' Rights, National Crop Evaluation Centre, Department of Agriculture, Food and Marine, Backweston Farm, Leixlip, Co. Kildare
(e-mail: donal.coleman@agriculture.gov.ie)

JAPON / JAPAN / JAPAN / JAPÓN

Katsumi YAMAGUCHI, Director, Plant Variety Protection Office, Intellectual Property Division, Food Industry Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), Tokyo
(e-mail: katsumi_yamaguchi130@maff.go.jp)

Kenji NUMAGUCHI, Chief Examiner, Plant Variety Protection Office, Intellectual Property Division, Food Industry Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), Tokyo
(e-mail: kenji_numaguchi760@maff.go.jp)

LETTONIE / LATVIA / LETTLAND / LETONIA

Inga OVSJANNIKA (Ms.), Senior Officer, Division of Seed Certification and Plant Variety Protection, Seed Control Department, State Plant Protection Service, Riga
(e-mail: inga.ovsjannika@vaad.gov.lv)

MAROC / MOROCCO / MAROKKO / MARRUECOS

Zoubida TAOUSSI (Mrs.), Chargée de la protection des obtentions végétales, Office National de Sécurité de Produits Alimentaires, Rabat
(e-mail: ztaoussi67@gmail.com)

MEXIQUE / MEXICO / MEXIKO / MÉXICO

Maria del Pilar ESCOBAR BAUTISTA (Mrs.), Counsellor, Misión Permanente, Ginebra
(e-mail: pescobar@sre.gob.mx)

NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE / NEW ZEALAND / NEUSEELAND / NUEVA ZELANDIA

Christopher J. BARNABY, Assistant Commissioner / Principal Examiner for Plant Variety Rights, Plant Variety Rights Office, Intellectual Property Office of New Zealand, Intellectual Property Office of New Zealand, Plant Variety Rights, Ministry of Economic Development, Christchurch
(e-mail: Chris.Barnaby@pvr.govt.nz)

OMAN / OMAN / OMAN / OMÁN

Ali AL LAWATI, Plant Genetic Resources Expert, Oman Animal and Plant Genetic Resources Center, The Research Council, Muscat
(e-mail: ali.allawati@trc.gov.om)
Mohammed AL-BALUSHI, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva
(e-mail: oman_wto@bluewin.ch)

ORGANISATION AFRICAINE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (OAPI) /
AFRICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (OAPI) /
AFRIKANISCHE ORGANISATION FÜR GEISTIGES EIGENTUM (OAPI) /
ORGANIZACIÓN AFRICANA DE LA PROPIEDAD INTELECTUAL (OAPI)

Dosso MÉMASSI, Directeur, Département de la protection de la propriété industrielle, Organisation africaine de la propriété intellectuelle (OAPI), Yaoundé
(e-mail: dossomemassi@gmail.com)
Vladimir Ludovic MEZUI ONO, Examineur Brevet chimie, Organisation africaine de la propriété intellectuelle (OAPI), Yaoundé
(e-mail: mezuiono@hotmail.com)

PANAMA / PANAMA / PANAMA / PANAMÁ

Rafael Ernesto MONTERREY GONZÁLEZ, Jefe del Departamento de Variedades Vegetales, Dirección General del Registro de la Propiedad Intelectual, Ministerio de Comercio e Industrias, Dirección General del Registro de la Propiedad Industrial, Ciudad de Panamá
(e-mail: rmonterrey@mici.gob.pa)

PARAGUAY / PARAGUAY / PARAGUAY / PARAGUAY

Nidia Concepción TALAVERA GODOY (Sra.), Directora, Dirección de Semillas, Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Sanidad Vegetal y de Semillas (SENAVE), San Lorenzo
(e-mail: nidia.talavera@senave.gov.py)

PAYS-BAS / NETHERLANDS / NIEDERLANDE / PAÍSES BAJOS

Marien VALSTAR, Senior Policy Officer, Seeds and Plant Propagation Material, Ministry of Economic Affairs, DG AGRO & NATURE, The Hague
(e-mail: m.valstar@minez.nl)
Kees Jan GROENEWOUD, Secretary, Dutch Board for Plant Variety (Raad voor Plantenrassen), Naktuinbouw, Roelofarendsveen
(e-mail: c.j.a.groenewoud@naktuinbouw.nl)
Bert SCHOLTE, Head Department Variety Testing, Naktuinbouw NL, Roelofarendsveen
(e-mail: b.scholte@naktuinbouw.nl)
Kees VAN ETTEKOVEN, Senior PVP Policy Advisor, Naktuinbouw NL, Roelofarendsveen
(e-mail: c.v.ettekoven@naktuinbouw.nl)
Henk SCHOUTEN, Wageningen University and Research
(e-mail: henk.schouten@wur.nl)

PÉROU / PERU / PERU / PERÚ

Roger Alberto BECERRA GALLARDO, Coordinador de los Componentes de Protección de Obtentores Vegetales y Acceso a Recursos Genéticos, Sub Dirección de Gestión de la Innovación Agraria, Dirección de Gestión de Innovación Agraria, Instituto Nacional de Innovación Agraria (INIA), Lima
(e-mail: dpirrgg@inia.gob.pe)
[via WebEx]

POLOGNE / POLAND / POLEN / POLONIA

Marcin KRÓL, Head, DUS Testing Department, Research Centre for Cultivar Testing (COBORU), Slupia Wielka
(e-mail: m.krol@coboru.pl)

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE / REPUBLIC OF KOREA / REPUBLIK KOREA / REPÚBLICA DE COREA

Eunhee SOH (Ms.), Deputy Director, Senior Examiner, Korea Seed and Variety Service (KSVS), Seobu Office, Jeonllabuk-do
(e-mail: eunhee.soh@korea.kr)

Jino YOO, Deputy Director, Senior Examiner, Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), Daejeon Metropolitan City
(e-mail: jino0524@kipo.go.kr)

RÉPUBLIQUE DE MOLDOVA / REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA / REPUBLIK MOLDAU / REPÚBLICA DE MOLDOVA

Mihail MACHIDON, Chairman, State Commission for Crops Variety Testing and Registration (SCCVTR), Chisinau
(e-mail: info@cstsp.md)

Ala GUSAN (Ms.), Head, Patents Division, Inventions and Plant Varieties Department, State Agency on Intellectual Property of the Republic of Moldova (AGEPI), Chisinau
(e-mail: ala.gusan@agepi.gov.md)

RÉPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE / DOMINICAN REPUBLIC / DOMINIKANISCHE REPUBLIK / REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA

Rafael COLON NUNEZ, Enc. Producción, BIO-ARROZ, Ministerio de Agricultura, Santo Domingo
(e-mail: ing.rafaelcolon@hotmail.com)

Antonio FERNÁNDEZ ACOSTA, Inspector de certificación de semilla, BIO-ARROZ, Ministerio de Agricultura, Santo Domingo
(e-mail: ing-antoniofedez-08@hotmail.com)

RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE / CZECH REPUBLIC / TSCHECHISCHE REPUBLIK / REPÚBLICA CHECA

Radmila ŠAFARÍKOVÁ (Ms.), Coordinator for International Cooperation, National Plant Variety Office, Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture (UKZUZ), Brno
(e-mail: radmila.safarikova@ukzuz.cz)

ROUMANIE / ROMANIA / RUMÄNIEN / RUMANIA

Cristian Irinel MOCANU, Head of Legal Department, State Institute for Variety Testing and Registration, Bucarest
(e-mail: irinel_mocanu@istis.ro)

Aura Giorgiana MINDRUTA (Ms.), Expert, State Institute for Variety Testing and Registration (ISTIS), Bucarest
(e-mail: aura_mindruta@istis.ro)

ROYAUME-UNI / UNITED KINGDOM / VEREINIGTES KÖNIGREICH / REINO UNIDO

Andrew MITCHELL, Head of Varieties and Seeds, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), Cambridge
(e-mail: andrew.mitchell@defra.gsi.gov.uk)

Adrian M.I. ROBERTS, External Development Manager, Biomathematics & Statistics Scotland (BioSS), Edinburgh
(e-mail: a.roberts@bioess.ac.uk)

Mara RAMANS (Ms.), Technical Liaison Officer, Principal Plant Variety and Seeds Delivery, Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA), Cambridge
(e-mail: mara.ramans@apha.gsi.gov.uk)

Sally WATSON (Mrs.), Biometrics Branch, Agri-Food & Biosciences Institute, Belfast
(e-mail: sally.watson@afbini.gov.uk)

Gerard HOPPE, Head of DUS Testing, AFBI Crossnacreevy Plant Testing Station, Belfast
(e-mail: gerard.hoppe@afbni.gov.uk)

SLOVAQUIE / SLOVAKIA / SLOWAKEI / ESLOVAQUIA

Bronislava BÁTOROVÁ (Ms.), National Coordinator for the Cooperation of the Slovak Republic with UPOV/
Senior Officer, Department of Variety Testing, Central Controlling and Testing Institute in Agriculture
(ÚKSÚP), Nitra

(e-mail: bronislava.batorova@uksup.sk)

L'uba GASPAROVÁ (Ms.), Senior Officer, Deputy of the National Coordinator for the Cooperation of the
Slovak Republic with UPOV, Central Controlling and Testing Institute in Agriculture (UKSUP), Bratislava

(e-mail: Luba.Gasparova@uksup.sk)

SUISSE / SWITZERLAND / SCHWEIZ / SUIZA

Manuela BRAND (Ms.), Plant Variety Rights Office, Plant Health and Varieties, Office fédéral de l'agriculture
(OFAG), Bern

(e-mail: manuela.brand@blw.admin.ch)

TUNISIE / TUNISIA / TUNESIEN / TÚNEZ

Fatma Chiha BELGAROUÏ (Mme), Directeur de l'homologation et du contrôle de la qualité, Direction
Générale de la Protection et Contrôle de la Qualité des produits Agricoles, Ministère de l'Agriculture, des
Ressources Hydrauliques et de la Pêche, Tunis

(e-mail: fatmachiha@yahoo.fr)

TURQUIE / TURKEY / TÜRKEI / TURQUÍA

Mehmet ÇAKMAK, PBR Expert, Seed Department, General Directorate of Plant Production, Ministry of
Food, Agriculture and Livestock, Ankara, Turkey

E-mail: mehmet.cakmak@tarim.gov.tr

Mehmet SİĞIRCI, Head, Seed Department, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, Ankara, Turkey

E-mail: mehmet.sigirci@tarim.gov.tr

UNION EUROPÉENNE / EUROPEAN UNION / EUROPÄISCHE UNION / UNIÓN EUROPEA

Bronislava BÁTOROVÁ (Ms.), National Coordinator for the Cooperation of the Slovak Republic with UPOV/
Senior Officer, Department of Variety Testing, Central Controlling and Testing Institute in Agriculture
(ÚKSÚP), Nitra

(e-mail: bronislava.batorova@uksup.sk)

Päivi MANNERKORPI (Ms.), Team Leader - Unit G1, Plant Reproductive Material, Directorate General for
Health and Food Safety (DG SANCO), European Commission, Bruxelles

(e-mail: paivi.mannerkorpi@ec.europa.eu)

Dirk THEOBALD, Head of the Technical Unit, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), Angers

(e-mail: theobald@cpvo.europa.eu)

Sergio SEMON, Vegetable Expert, Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), Angers

(e-mail: semon@cpvo.europa.eu)

[via WebEx]

II. OBSERVATEURS / OBSERVERS / BEOBACHTER / OBSERVADORES

ARABIE SAOUDITE / SAUDI ARABIA / SAUDI-ARABIEN / ARABIA SAUDITA

Fahd Saad ALAJLAN, Director of the Legal Department and Head of the Plant Variety Protection Section,
King Abdulaziz City for Science and Technology (KACST), Riyadh

(e-mail: fajlan@kacst.edu.sa)

Bandar ALHOMED, Consultant Judge, KSA, Riyadh

(e-mail: bandar8580@hotmail.com)

Badie Saud ALBADIE, Consultant Judge, KSA, Riyadh

(e-mail: abosaud1384@hotmail.com)

GUATEMALA / GUATEMALA / GUATEMALA / GUATEMALA

Flor de Maria GARCIA DIAZ (Ms.), Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

(e-mail: flor.garcia@wtoguatemala.ch)

THAÏLANDE / THAILAND / THAILAND / TAILANDIA

Anan AKSONSRI, Executive Director, Office of Plant Variety Protection, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Bangkok
(e-mail: anan.a@doa.in.th)

Pornthep SRITANATORN, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Thailand to the WTO, Geneva
(e-mail: pornthep@thaiwto.com)

Pan PANKHAO, Agricultural Research Officer, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Bangkok
(e-mail: ppk1969@hotmail.com)

III. ORGANISATIONS / ORGANIZATIONS / ORGANISATIONEN / ORGANIZACIONES

ASSOCIATION FOR PLANT BREEDING FOR THE BENEFIT OF SOCIETY (APBREBES)

Sangeeta SHASHIKANT (Ms.), President, Association for Plant Breeding for the Benefit of Society (APBREBES), Bonn
(e-mail: ssangeeta@myjaring.net)

ORGANISATION DE COOPÉRATION ET DE DÉVELOPPEMENT ÉCONOMIQUES (OCDE) /
ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD) /
ORGANISATION FÜR WIRTSCHAFTLICHE ZUSAMMENARBEIT UND ENTWICKLUNG (OECD) /
ORGANIZACIÓN DE COOPERACIÓN Y DESARROLLO ECONÓMICOS (OCDE)

Csaba GASPAR, Programme Manager, OECD Seed Schemes & OECD Forest Seed and Plant Scheme, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Paris
(e-mail: csaba.gaspar@oecd.org)

COMMUNAUTÉ INTERNATIONALE DES OBTENTEURS DE PLANTES ORNEMENTALES ET
FRUITIÈRES À REPRODUCTION ASEXUÉE (CIOPORA) / INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY OF
BREEDERS OF ASEXUALLY REPRODUCED ORNAMENTAL AND FRUIT PLANTS (CIOPORA) /
INTERNATIONALE GEMEINSCHAFT DER ZÜCHTER VEGETATIV VERMEHRBARER ZIERUND
OBSTPFLANZEN (CIOPORA) / COMUNIDAD INTERNACIONAL DE OBTENTORES DE VARIEDADES
ORNAMENTALES Y FRUTALES DE REPRODUCCIÓN ASEXUADA (CIOPORA)

Dominique THÉVENON (Mme), Board member, Treasurer – CIOPORA, AIGN®, International Community of Breeders of Asexually Reproduced Ornamental and Fruit Plants (CIOPORA), Hamburg
(e-mail: t.dominique4@aliceadsl.fr)

José Ignacio CUBERO SALMERON, Prof. (emeritus) of genetics and Plant Breeding, Eurosemillas, Cordoba
(e-mail: jicubero@uco.es)

CROPLIFE INTERNATIONAL

Marcel BRUINS, Consultant, CropLife International, Bruxelles
(e-mail: mbruins1964@gmail.com)

François-Xavier MULLER, EU Corn Breeding IP/QMS Manager, Monsanto SAS, Monbéqui
(e-mail: francois-xavier.muller@monsanto.com)

INTERNATIONAL SEED FEDERATION (ISF)

Szabolcs RUTHNER, Regulatory Affairs Executive, International Seed Federation (ISF), Nyon
(e-mail: s.ruthner@worldseed.org)

Amy D. CURTIS (Ms.), Soybean & Cotton Patent Scientist, Monsanto US, St. Louis
(e-mail: amy.curtis@monsanto.com)

Stevan MADJARAC, Germplasm IP Lead, American Seed Trade Association (ASTA), Alexandria
(e-mail: s.madjarac@gmail.com)

Astrid M. SCHENKEVELD (Ms.), Specialist, Variety Registration & Protection, Rijk Zwaan Zaadteelt en Zaadhandel B.V., De Lier
(e-mail: a.schenkeveld@rijckwaan.nl)

EUROPEAN SEED ASSOCIATION (ESA)

Christophe ROUILLARD, Technical Manager Plant Health and Seed Trade, Brussels
(e-mail: christopherouillard@euroseeds.eu)

ASIA AND PACIFIC SEED ASSOCIATION (APSA)

Heidi GALLANT (Ms.), Executive Director, Asia and Pacific Seed Association (APSA), Bangkok
(e-mail: heidi@apsaseed.org)

IV. BUREAU DE L'OMPI / OFFICE OF WIPO / BÜRO DER WIPO / OFICINA DE LA OMPI

Lili CHEN (Ms.), Software Developer, Brand Databases Section, Global Databases Division
José APPAVE, Senior Service Data Administration Clerk, Brand Databases Section, Global Databases Division

V. BUREAU / OFFICER / VORSITZ / OFICINA

Kees VAN ETTEKOVEN, Chair
Nik HULSE, Vice-Chair

VI. BUREAU DE L'UPOV / OFFICE OF UPOV / BÜRO DER UPOV / OFICINA DE LA UPOV

Peter BUTTON, Vice Secretary-General
Yolanda HUERTA (Ms.), Legal Counsel
Tomochika MOTOMURA, Technical/Regional Officer (Asia)
Ben RIVOIRE, Technical/Regional Officer (Africa, Arab countries)
Leontino TAVEIRA, Technical/Regional Officer (Latin America, Caribbean countries)
Hend MADHOUR (Ms.), Data Modeler and Business Needs Analyst
Romy OERTEL (Ms.), Secretary II
Jessica MAY (Ms.), Secretary I

[L'annexe II suit /
Annex II follows /
Anlage II folgt /
Sigue el Anexo II]

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAFT TEST GUIDELINES
PRIOR TO THEIR ADOPTION AT THE FIFTY-THIRD SESSION
OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (TC)

Partial Revisions

TC/53/25 Partial Revision of the Test Guidelines for Dianella (*Dianella* Lam. ex Juss.)

The following table contains the comments by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017. All comments are already incorporated in document TC/53/25, submitted to the TC:

Cover page	to read "by an expert from Australia"
new Char. 16	- "medium concave" to read "moderately concave" - "medium convex" to read "moderately convex"

TC/53/26 Partial Revision of the Test Guidelines for Lavandula/Lavander (*Lavandula* L.)

The following table contains the comments by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017. All comments are already incorporated in document TC/53/26, submitted to the TC:

new after Char. 7	to be placed before Char. 7 (length and width before serration)
new after Char. 30	to be placed after Char. 28

TC/53/27 Partial Revision of the Test Guidelines for Tomato

The following table contains the comments by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017. All comments are already incorporated in document TC/53/27, submitted to the TC:

Ad. 57 (i), (ii)	"2. Quarantine status": to add "see 13." after "yes"
------------------	--

TC/53/28 Partial Revision of the Test Guidelines for Tomato Rootstocks

Ad. 16	to read "Varieties of certain interspecific crosses for tomato rootstocks may not produce fruits, or exceptionally produce few very small fruits (note 1)."
--------	---


New Test Guidelines

Abelia (<i>Abelia R. BR.</i>)	TG/ABELI(proj.6)	Ms. Françoise Jourdan (FR)	TWO	*
	No. of chars.: 36 No. of (*) chars.: 21	(Interested experts: CA, GB, JP, KR, MX, NZ, QZ)		

(a) Changes to document TG/ABELI(proj.5), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are already incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (document TG/ABELI(proj.6)), submitted to the TC:

Cover page	to add missing SW footnote
5.3 (d)	to check color groups (groups 1 and 3 read "green") <i>Leading Expert: color groups to read as follows:</i> <i>Gr. 1: green</i> <i>Gr. 2: yellow green</i> <i>Gr. 3: grey green</i> <i>Gr. 4: purple green</i>
5.3 (f)	to check whether to delete "Gr. 2: pinkish white" (state 1 "pinkish white" was deleted from Char. 21 after TWO) <i>Leading Expert: agreed</i>
Chars. 8, 9, 10, 25, 26	to confirm whether MG is the correct method of observation (probably the 5 plants are measured individually) <i>Leading Expert: MG is the correct method of observation</i>
Char. 11	to check with Leading Expert whether to invert order of states 1 and 2 (according to TGP/14) <i>Leading Expert: agreed</i>
Char. 12	to delete (+) and add (c) <i>Leading Expert: agreed</i>
Char. 14	to delete (+) and add (d) <i>Leading Expert: delete wording only; keep (+) and illustrations (see comment on Ad. 14)</i>
Char. 15	to delete (+) and add (d) <i>Leading Expert: agreed</i>
Char. 22	to check whether to be indicated as PQ <i>Leading Expert: agreed</i>
Char. 24	example variety of state 1 to read "Raspberry Profusion" (capital P)
Chars. 24 to 34	to specify time of observation <i>Leading Expert: to add (h) to Characteristics 24 to 34</i>
Char. 35	to check if VG is used or can be deleted <i>Leading Expert: to delete VG</i>
Char. 36	to read "Plant: number of flowers", states "few" to "many" <i>Leading Expert: agreed</i>
8.1 (b)	to be added to Chars. 5 to 19 <i>Leading Expert: agreed</i>
8.1 (f)	- grid applies only to char. 11, to be presented as Ad. 11 - (f) to be deleted from char. 8 to 10 and grid to become Ad. 11 <i>Leading Expert: agreed</i> - to check grid format (use format acc. to TGP/14)
Ad. 12	to be deleted (see (c)) <i>Leading Expert: agreed</i>
Ad. 14	to delete sentence (see (d)) <i>Leading Expert: agreed</i>
Ad. 15	to be deleted (see (d)) <i>Leading Expert: agreed</i>
TQ 1.	to add box 1.3 Species <i>Leading Expert: agreed</i>

(b) Changes to document TG/ABELI(proj.5), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are not incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (TG/ABELI(proj.6)), submitted to the TC, but which will be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

4.2	to be numbered 4.2.1 and add new paragraph as 4.2.2 (see document TGP/7/5): “These Test Guidelines have been developed for the examination of vegetatively propagated varieties. For varieties with other types of propagation the recommendations in the General Introduction and document TGP/13 “Guidance for new types and species”, Section 4.5 “Testing Uniformity” should be followed.” <i>to be approved by TWO by correspondence</i>
Char. 34	to add explanation (to add limits within the scale of notes) <i>Leading Expert: to add example variety “Bridal Bouquet” for state 3 strong to be approved by TWO by correspondence</i>
Char., Ad. 11	- to check whether illustrations can be improved (use photos instead of drawings?) <i>Leading Expert: to use the following illustration for state 2 “lanceolate”</i> 

Aglaonema (<i>Aglaonema</i> Schott.)	TG/AGLAO(proj.9)	Mr. Kenji Numaguchi (JP)	TWO	
	No. of chars.: 55 No. of (*) chars.: 48	(Interested experts: AU, KR, NL, NZ, QZ, ZA)		

(a) Changes to document TG/AGLAO(proj.8), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are already incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (TG/AGLAO(proj.9)), submitted to the TC:

Cover page	to add missing SW footnote
Char. 13	to be indicated as QN
Char. 16	- to add new state 1 “single-colored” - to delete (j)
Char. 21	state 13 to read “throughout”
Chars. 25, 30	to insert a space before bracket
Char. 35	to correct spelling of “reference”
Char. 36	to add new state 1 “single-colored”
Chars. 35 to 49	to delete (e)
Chars. 37, 40	to add space between “leaf” and “blade”
Char 38, 43, 43 and 8.1(f) Example 3	to delete “pattern of”
Char. 46	to correct spelling of “along” and add space after comma in state 15
Char. 54	to read: “Leaf blade: number of veins”
Char. 55	to read “Leaf blade: position of midrib”
8.1 (a)	explanation to read “Unless otherwise indicated, observations on the leaf should be made on fully grown leaves from the middle third of the plant.”
8.1 (b)	explanation should be moved to Ad. 3 and Ad. 6
8.1 (d)	- explanation should be moved to Ad. 9 and 10 - leaf blade: the guidelines at the drawings should touch the bottom of leaf blade.
8.1 (e)	to read “To be observed on the upper side of the leaf.”

8.1 (f)	<p>“Where the characteristics refer to colors as “color 1”, “color 2” etc., they are to be recorded in the order that they appear on the RHS chart, i.e. color 1 is the one with the lowest number, color 2 with the second lowest and so on. For example, if the leaves are Green 137A patched with White 155A, Green 137A will be color 1 and White 155A color 2. If two colors are on the same page of the chart, for example Green 137A and Green 137D, 137A is regarded as the lower numbered color. It should be noted that under this system, ranking is independent of surface area, so the color covering the greatest surface area may be classified as color 3 or 4. The Guideline makes provision for four colors, if there are more, the color(s) with the smallest surface area(s) should be disregarded.</p> <p>In <i>Aglaonema</i> leaf color is very significant to the overall appearance of the variety. Leaves often have several colors in different patterns. This guideline allows the description of up to four colors using the RHS Colour Charts as well as the distributions, the patterns formed and the areas covered. Although the colors are referred to as “color 1”, “color 2”, “color 3” and “color 4” in the headings, this does not indicate a ranking according to prominence or area covered. The order in which the colors should be observed is dictated by the order the colors appear in the RHS Colour Charts, as described in the paragraph above. Example varieties have not been provided for the leaf color characteristics. This is because the number of combinations of observations that this guideline allows for is larger than the number of combinations seen. Providing example varieties for all states of expression in these cases would be misleading. In order to provide an illustration of the recording method, different worked examples are provided as follows:”</p>
8.1 (g) and (j)	see comment on Chars. 16 and 36, consequently (g) and (j) can be combined with state 1 “single-colored/none”
8.1 (h)	to improve formatting of photos (same size and distance between photos) <i>provided by Leading Experts</i>
Ad. 4	to invert illustrations for states 1 and 5
Ad. 51	to reinsert explanation as in proj.7
Ad. 54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to add “To be observed on the lower side of the leaf.” - to improve illustrations to have same size leaves, states 2 and 3 need better differentiation <i>provided by Leading Experts</i>

(b) Changes to document TG/AGLAO(proj.8), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are not incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (TG/AGLAO(proj.9)), submitted to the TC, but which will be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

4.2	<p>to be numbered 4.2.1 and add new paragraph as 4.2.2 (see document TGP/7/5): “These Test Guidelines have been developed for the examination of vegetatively propagated varieties. For varieties with other types of propagation the recommendations in the General Introduction and document TGP/13 “Guidance for new types and species”, Section 4.5 “Testing Uniformity” should be followed.” <i>to be approved by TWO by correspondence</i></p>
8.1 (a)	(a) applies to 53 out of 55 characteristics, to have a general explanation instead of (a)
TQ 7.3 (c), (d)	to be moved to TQ 5

Cassava (<i>Manihot esculenta</i> Crantz.)	TG/CASSAV(proj.8)	Mr. Simeon Kibet (KE), Mr. Fabrício Santos (BR)	TWA/ TWV	*
	No. of chars.: 26 No. of (*) chars.: 15	(Interested experts: CN, CO, TZ, ZA, ISF)		

(a) Changes to document TG/CASSAV(proj.7), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are already incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (document TG/CASSAV(proj.8)), submitted to the TC:

Char. 16	- to check if 2 notes (is it really QL?) are appropriate or if intermediate expressions occur (see e. g. Maize: Char. 7 Stem: degree of zigzag – (1) absent or very slight, (2) slight, (3) strong - if QL is correct, to read “Stem: zigzag” with states (1) absent and (9) present <i>Leading Expert: it is QL</i>
Ad. 9	to check whether to improve illustrations (diagrams instead of current photo?) <i>provided by Leading Expert</i>
Ad. 11	to improve illustration (replace with photo from Ad. 12 and add bars to indicate length) <i>provided by Leading Expert</i>
Ad. 16	state “zigzag” to have note 9 <i>see comment on Char. 16</i>
Ad. 19	to delete illustration and keep wording only

(b) Changes to document TG/CASSAV(proj.7), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are not incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (TG/CASSAV(proj.8)), submitted to the TC, but which will be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

4.2	to be numbered 4.2.1 and add new paragraph as 4.2.2 (see document TGP/7/5): “These Test Guidelines have been developed for the examination of vegetatively propagated varieties. For varieties with other types of propagation the recommendations in the General Introduction and document TGP/13 “Guidance for new types and species”, Section 4.5 “Testing Uniformity” should be followed.” <i>to be approved by TWA and TWV by correspondence</i>
Ad. 20	to add arrow to stipe in illustration for state 3

Scorpion Weed (<i>Phacelia tanacetifolia</i> Benth.)	TG/PHACE(proj.6)	Ms. Bogna Kowalczyk (PL)	TWA	*
	No. of chars.: 30 No. of (*) chars.: 12	(Interested experts: AT, CZ, DE, FR, QZ, RO, ESA, ISF)		

(a) Changes to document TG/PHACE(proj.5), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are already incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (document TG/PHACE(proj.6)), submitted to the TC:

Cover page	to add missing SW footnote
Cover page	to check whether to delete “English Bluebell” (not in GENIE) <i>Leading Expert: to replace “English Bluebell” with “California Bluebell”</i>
3.1.2	to be deleted
Char. 12	to read “1000 seed weight”

(b) Changes to document TG/PHACE(proj.5), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are not incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (TG/PHACE(proj.6)), submitted to the TC, but which will be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

4.2	to be numbered 4.2.1 and add new paragraph as 4.2.2 (see document TGP/7/5): “These Test Guidelines have been developed for the examination of cross-pollinated varieties. For varieties with other types of propagation the recommendations in the General Introduction and document TGP/13 “Guidance for new types and species”, Section 4.5 “Testing Uniformity” should be followed.” <i>to be approved by TWA by correspondence</i>
Char. 9	- to reduce scale to have notes 1, 3, 5 - to add example variety “Wolga” for state “long” <i>to be approved by TWA by correspondence</i>
Char. 10	- to replace example variety “Factotum” with “Oka, Wolga” in state 1 “short” <i>to be approved by TWA by correspondence</i>

UROCHLOA	TG/UROCH(proj.11)	Mr. Fabrício Santos (BR)	TWA	*
	No. of chars.: 21 No. of (*) chars.: 16	(Interested experts: AU, CO, MX, ZA, ISF)		

(a) Changes to document TG/UROCH(proj.10), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are already incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (document TG/UROCH(proj.11)), submitted to the TC:

Chars. 6, 7, 8	to delete (b)
Char. 11	to read “Leaf blade: hairs”
Chars. 14 to 17	to change the order of characteristics: “Inflorescence: length of rachis”, “Inflorescence: shape of rachis in cross section”, “Inflorescence: length of basal racemes”, “Inflorescence: length of peduncles”
Char. 17	to check whether to add (a) <i>Leading Expert: yes, add (a)</i>
Char. 20	to delete (+) and to add (a)
Ad. 19	to be deleted
Ad. 21	to read “The time of beginning of flowering is reached when 50% of the plants have at least one inflorescence fully emerged.”
9.	to check relevance of 2 nd , 4 th and 5 th reference and whether to delete them <i>Leading Expert: Yes, delete (it referred to the methodology of analyzing the ploidy that no longer exists in the guideline).</i>

(b) Changes to document TG/UROCH(proj.10), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are not incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (TG/UROCH(proj.11)), submitted to the TC, but which will be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

4.2	to be numbered 4.2.1 and add new paragraph as 4.2.2 (see document TGP/7/5): “These Test Guidelines have been developed for the examination of apomictic and cross-pollinated varieties. For varieties with other types of propagation the recommendations in the General Introduction and document TGP/13 “Guidance for new types and species”, Section 4.5 “Testing Uniformity” should be followed.” <i>to be approved by TWA by correspondence</i>
Chars. 11, 12	to check use of example variety “BRS Tupi” (“BRS Tupi” used for “absent” in Char. 11 and “on upper surface only” in char. 12) <i>Leading Expert: The mistake is in Char. 11. Please delete “BRS Tupi” from example of absent hairs (Char. 11). The corrected variety is “BRS Piatã”</i> <i>to be approved by TWA by correspondence</i>

Char. 21	to check whether to read "Date of heading" (Is it really time of beginning of flowering? Are there already open flowers when the inflorescence is fully emerged?) <i>Leading Expert: We would like to keep as it is (Time of beginning of flowering). The accorded way to analyze the characteristic is when 50% of the plants have at least one inflorescence fully emerged. At the moment of the inflorescence fully emerged, there are flowers that are not opened yet (the stigma has not emerged yet) (see Char. 20 also)</i>
TQ 1	to be presented in alphabetical order

(c) Changes to document TG/UROCH(proj.11), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on April 3 and 4, 2017, which are to be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

Char. 21	to read "Time of inflorescence emergence"
----------	---

Revisions

Wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L. emend. Fiori et Paol.)	TG/3/12(proj.6)	Ms. Virgienie Bertoux (FR)	TWA	*
	No. of chars.: 27 No. of (*) chars.: 13	(Interested experts: AR, AT, AU, BG, BR, CA, CL, CN, CZ, DE, DK, ES, FI, GB, HR, HU, IT, JP, KE, KR, NL, NZ, PL, QZ, RO, SK, UA, ZA, CLI, ESA, ISF)		

Changes to document TG/3/12(proj.6), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on April 3 and 4, 2017, which are to be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

3.4.4	to be added to German version
4.2	to be numbered 4.2.1 and add new paragraph as 4.2.2 (see document TGP/7/5): "These Test Guidelines have been developed for the examination of [type or types of propagation] varieties. For varieties with other types of propagation the recommendations in the General Introduction and document TGP/13 "Guidance for new types and species", Section 4.5 "Testing Uniformity" should be followed." <i>to be approved by TWA by correspondence</i>
6.5	to read "A sample size of 100 plants/parts of plants B sample size of 2000 plants or parts of plants" (numbers of plants inverted)
Char. 3	to replace "(W) SY Ideo" by "(W) Homeros" as example variety of state 7 <i>to be approved by TWA by correspondence</i>
Ad. 15	to read "The density is the ratio of the number of spikelets per ear length."
8.3	to add growth stage 43 "Boots just visibly swollen"
9.	first literature reference to read "ZADOKS, J. C., CHANG, T. T. and KONZAK, C. F., 1974: ..."
TQ 4	to format according to TGP/7 and add text boxes for completion for "(a) any male sterile lines" and "maintenance system of male sterile lines"
Annex, Part II	to add characteristics numbers (28 to 20)
Annex, Part III	- 3.2 to read "...made up to 1 l with distilled water..." - 4.2.2 to read "...40 µl TEMED (use straight from bottle)..." - 5 <u>Recognition of Glutenin Alleles</u> , in the table for band 20 Molecular weight (kDa) to be indicated as 94 - to check formatting

Lettuce (<i>Lactuca sativa</i> L.)	TG/13/11(proj.5)	Ms. Amanda van Dijk (NL)	TWV	*
	No. of chars.: 53 No. of (*) chars.: 14	(Interested experts : BR, CZ, DE, ES, FR, IT, JP, KR, MA, QZ, ZA, CropLife, ESA, ISF)		

(a) Changes to document TG/13/11(proj.4), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are already incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (document TG/13/11(proj.5)), submitted to the TC:

Cover page	to add missing SW footnote
5.3	to read "In a first step, the collection should be divided according to types as described in the Table 1. In cases of doubt to which type a variety belongs to, it should be tested under consideration of all relevant types."
5.3, 8.1 (a), TQ 7.3	to use "type" throughout the document (to harmonize use of "Type" or "Growth type")
Char. 4	to read "Only varieties with Plant: degree of overlapping of upper part of leaves: absent or weak: ..."
Chars. 7, 8, 9	to read "Only varieties with Leaf: number of divisions: absent or very few: ..."
Char. 9	- to check whether cross section is correct (or is it longitudinal section?) - to improve illustrations - to add missing (+) <i>Leading Expert: to read "...longitudinal section" and provided improved illustrations</i>
Chars. 19	to check whether VS is used or should be deleted <i>Leading Expert: Originally we proposed VG only. However, during TWV 2015 it was decided to add VS. Keep as it is</i>
Char. 23	to read "Only varieties with Leaf: type of incisions of margin: irregularly dentate, bi- or tridentate: Leaf:..."
Chars. 26, 27, 28, 34	to read "Only varieties with Plant: degree of overlapping of upper part of leaves: medium or strong:"
Char. 30	to have states narrow, medium, broad
8.1 (a)	to be moved to 8.3 and add reference to 8.3 in 5.3 below table
8.1 (b)	to read "...of overlapping of upper part of leaves absent or weak..." (2 nd line)
8.1 (c)	to read "...of overlapping of upper part of leaves medium or strong..." to read "...of overlapping of upper part of leaves absent or weak..."
Ad. 10	to delete upper photos with heads.
Ad. 21, 22, 23, 24	to read "...of the margin at the distal half of the leaf."
Ad. 23	to delete drawings
Ad. 36	to improve explanation <i>provided by Leading Expert</i>
Ad. 37	to read "Observations should be made on the stem of bolted plants after the first flowers are open. For varieties with very late time of beginning of bolting and with strong degree of overlapping of leaves, the cover leaves of the head may be incised just before deterioration in order to be able to observe fasciation."
Ad. 53, 11.2	- to be presented in two separate tables - "inoculation by sowing seeds on contaminated soil", "3. die" to be clarified (dead plant/seedling or dead seed?)
9.	10 th reference to read "...and Fontanges, ..."
TQ 7.3	see comment on 8.1 (a), to adjust reference to 8.3 accordingly

(b) Changes to document TG/13/11(proj.4), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are not incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (TG/13/11(proj.4)), submitted to the TC, but which will be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

4.2	to be numbered 4.2.1 and add new paragraph as 4.2.2 (see document TGP/7/5): “These Test Guidelines have been developed for the examination of seed propagated varieties. For varieties with other types of propagation the recommendations in the General Introduction and document TGP/13 “Guidance for new types and species”, Section 4.5 “Testing Uniformity” should be followed.” <i>to be approved by TWV by correspondence</i>
Char. 17	to check whether a 1, 2, 3 scale or 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 scale would be better? Leading Expert: <i>We propose to change to a 1-5 scale with 1 very thin, 2 thin, 3 medium, 4 thick, 5 very thick. We propose to add “Stefano” as example variety for note 1 (very thin).</i> <i>to be approved by TWV by correspondence</i>
Ad. 22	drawings should be allocated to notes Leading Expert: <i>Please, take care. The drawings were not meant to represent the states, but show examples how to observe this characteristic for the different types of incision. We propose to delete the drawings and to add to the picture the following text: The arrows point at the area to be observed.</i>

(c) Changes to document TG/13/11(proj.5), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on April 3 and 4, 2017, which are to be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

Ad. 22	- to delete photograph - to add sentence “The following drawings illustrate how to observe this characteristic for the different types of incision.”
--------	---

Freesia (<i>Freesia</i> Eckl. Ex Klatt)	TG/27/7(proj.5)	Mr. Henk de Greef (NL)	TWO	*
	No. of chars.: 53 No. of (*) chars.: 37	(Interested experts: JP, KR, MX, QZ, ZA)		

(a) Changes to document TG/27/7(proj.4), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are already incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (document TG/27/7(proj.5)), submitted to the TC:

1.2	to be deleted
4.2.2	to read “For the assessment of uniformity of vegetatively propagated varieties, ...”
Char. 15	to read “Spike: degree of zig-zag”
Char. 16	to read “Spike: curvature of distal part
Char. 22	to check whether to add example varieties <i>provided by Leading Expert</i>
Char. 23	to check whether to add example varieties <i>provided by Leading Expert</i>
Char. 30	to check wording: “Perianth throat: number of stripes on the ventral part of inner side”? <i>Leading Expert: agreed</i>
Chars. 33, 34, 35, 36	to use “segment” (singular)
8.1 (a)	to read “Observations should be made when 50% of the flowers on a spike have opened.”
8.1 (g)	to read “Observations on filament, anther, style and stigma should be made on single and semi-double flowers only.”
Ads. 11, 16	these explanations should be moved to the next page, respectively.
Ad. 19	to read “Single flowers have up to 6 tepals. Semi-double flowers have between 7 and 9 tepals. Double flowers have more than 9 tepals.”
Ad. 50	to replace “style” with “stigma”.

(b) Changes to document TG/27/7(proj.4), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are not incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (TG/27/7(proj.5)), submitted to the TC, but which will be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

4.2	to be numbered 4.2.1 and add new paragraph as 4.2.2 (see document TGP/7/5): “These Test Guidelines have been developed for the examination of vegetatively propagated varieties. For varieties with other types of propagation the recommendations in the General Introduction and document TGP/13 “Guidance for new types and species”, Section 4.5 “Testing Uniformity” should be followed.” <i>to be approved by TWO by correspondence</i>
Char. 20	to check whether to add explanation <i>Leading Expert: no</i>
8.1 (a), (f)	should be covered by a general explanation without label (all observations are made at the same stage)

Chestnut	TG/124/4(proj.4)	Mr. Katsumi Yamaguchi (JP)	TWF	
	No. of chars.: 45 No. of (*) chars.: 39	(Interested experts: CN, ES, FR, HU, KR, NZ, QZ, ZA)		

Changes to document TG/124/4(proj.4), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on April 3 and 4, 2017, which are to be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

4.2	to be numbered 4.2.1 and add new paragraph as 4.2.2 (see document TGP/7/5): “These Test Guidelines have been developed for the examination of vegetatively propagated varieties. For varieties with other types of propagation the recommendations in the General Introduction and document TGP/13 “Guidance for new types and species”, Section 4.5 “Testing Uniformity” should be followed.” <i>to be approved by TWV by correspondence</i>
6.4	to read “The different species are indicated with (A), (B), (C) after the example varieties.”
Char. 3	to check whether really MG
Char. 9	to add (+) and explanation
Char. 10	to read “Catkin: length”
Char. 11	to delete (c)
8.1	to check whether to invert (c) and (d) to follow chronological/morphological order as in the T.o.C (flower before leaf)
8.1 (b)	to read “...middle third of the shoot...”
8.1 (d)	to be deleted
Ad. 8	to be improved
Ad. 10	to read “The longest catkin on a fully developed inflorescence should be observed.”
Ad. 11	explanation contradictory to (c)
Ad. 12	to read “The total area of the leaf should be observed.”
Ad. 16	to delete “vertically”
Ad. 36	to read “opening of <u>the</u> involucre”
Ad. 38	to be deleted
Ad. 43	to read “The time of male flowering...”
9.	reference to Kozaki to read “Kozaki, I. et al., 1996: The fruit in Japan, Yokendo Ltd., JP, pp. 423, pp. 382-383”
TQ 4.2.1	to be completed as follows: 4.2.1 Vegetative propagation (a) cuttings [] (b) grafting [] (c) other (state method) []

Walnut (<i>Juglans regia</i> L.)	TG/125/7(proj.5)	Ms. Dong Pei (CN)	TWF	*
	No. of chars.: 31 No. of (*) chars.: 17	(Interested experts: ES, FR, HU, JP, KR, QZ, ZA, CIOPORA)		

Changes to document TG/125/7(proj.5), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on April 3 and 4, 2017, which are to be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

4.2	to be numbered 4.2.1 and add new paragraph as 4.2.2 (see document TGP/7/5): "These Test Guidelines have been developed for the examination of cross-pollinated varieties. For varieties with other types of propagation the recommendations in the General Introduction and document TGP/13 "Guidance for new types and species", Section 4.5 "Testing Uniformity" should be followed." <i>to be approved by TWV by correspondence</i>
Chars. 2, 3	to delete (b)
Char. 3	- to check wording of state 2 and whether to be improved - to check whether to add illustrations in Ad. 3
Char. 4	to delete "lateral" (specified in explication)
Char. 8	- to read "Infructescence: type" - state 4 to read "bunched"
Char. 10	- to check whether "ventral view" (see Ad. 10) - to review order of states and grid according to TGP/14
Char. 11	- to check whether "lateral view" (see Ad. 11) - to review order of states and grid according to TGP/14
Char. 12	to have order of states "reniform", "oblate", "circular", "elliptic"
Chars. 13, 14	to move wording in brackets to Ad. 13 and 14
Char. 23	to check whether to read "inner pleat wall" or "inner pleat wall" (see Ad. 23)
Char. 24	- to check method of observation (MG only?), otherwise adapt explanation - to add (+)
Char. 29	to check whether to be deleted (additional information provided in relation to Chars. 28 and 30?)
Char. 30	- to delete states in brackets (synonyms) - to delete (c)
8.1 (b)	to be deleted
8.1 (c)	to be deleted and provide individual explanations for Chars. 6 and 7
8.1 (e)	to explain how to measure and reword explanation (how is the precise water content determined?)
Ad. 10	to be reviewed
Ad. 11	to be reviewed
Ad. 12	to be presented without grid (all illustrations in one row)
Ad. 16	state 2 to read "on upper 2/3"
Ad. 24	to check whether to read "Thickness of the mid part of the shell should be measured."
Ad. 27	to check explanation versus states off expression

Leaf Chicory (<i>Cichorium intybus</i> L. var. <i>foliosum</i> Hegi)	TG/154/4(proj.6)	Ms. Romana Bravi (IT)	TWV	*
	No. of chars.: 31 No. of (*) chars.: 22	(Interested experts: FR, NL, QZ, CropLife, ESA, ISF)		

(a) Changes to document TG/154/4(proj.5), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are already incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (document TG/154/4(proj.6)), submitted to the TC:

Cover page	to add missing SW footnote
2.3	to read "... or 20 grams of seed"
3.1.2	to be deleted
3.3.2	to be deleted
Table 1	column 2 to read "in patches only"



5.3	- to have the same wording as in TG Lettuce: "In a first step, the collection should be divided according to types as described in the Table 1. In cases of doubt to which type a variety belongs to, it should be tested under consideration of in all relevant types." - to add heading for table "Table 1: Classification of types according to characteristics" - order of columns: first types, followed by characteristics according to order in table of chars. - to read "type" instead of "growth type" (throughout document)
6.5	growth stages not applicable
Char. 1	to delete "at 5-6 leaf stage" and to add explanation in 8.2
Char. 3	add (a)
Char. 5	state 6 to read "oblanceolate"
Char. 6	to be moved after Char. 4 (to have leaf length and width together)
Char. 9	to read "Leaf: anthocyanin distribution"
Char. 11	to read "Leaf: profile of upper side"
Char. 14	TWV/50 comment: "to add illustrations (drawings)" Leading Expert reply: I was not able to produce clear drawing of undulations because of three- dimensional shape of undulations (I should have used colors or grey/black.) <i>TC-EDC: example varieties are enough</i>
Char. 17	to check whether to have states "absent", "open", "closed"
Char. 24	to read "Only varieties with Plant: head formation: closed: Head: degree ..."
Char. 27	to read "Head: distribution of anthocyanin coloration of cover leaves"
8.1 (b)	to read "Observations should be made on leaves excluding the outer and center leaves."
8.1 (c)	to be deleted because already covered by (a).
Ad. 8	to read "To observe the total area excluding midrib."
8.3	to read "Leaf chicory types"
9.	to check and complete references
TQ 1	to check whether common name to read "Salad chicory"
TQ 6	to add example from the table of characteristics
TQ 7.3	to add request for information on type (see TG Lettuce)


(b) Changes to document TG/154/4(proj.5), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are not incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (TG/154/4(proj.6)), submitted to the TC, but which will be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

4.2	to be numbered 4.2.1 and add new paragraph as 4.2.2 (see document TGP/7/5): "These Test Guidelines have been developed for the examination of cross-pollinated varieties, hybrids and seed propagated inbred lines. For varieties with other types of propagation the recommendations in the General Introduction and document TGP/13 "Guidance for new types and species", Section 4.5 "Testing Uniformity" should be followed." <i>to be approved by TWV by correspondence</i>
Char. 18	to check whether to read "Time of harvest maturity" (see Ad. 18) <i>Leading Expert: I checked and I confirm that Char. 18 has to remain " Time of head formation". During the TWV it was agreed that harvest maturity was not applicable to leaf chicory because of the difficulty of evaluation and standardization in so different chicory types and influence of growth conditions.</i>

Ad. 18	<p>All varieties reach harvest maturity but not all varieties form a head. The explanation seems to describe harvest maturity. It is suggested to have “Time of harvest maturity” with the following wording: “Harvest maturity is specific to the plant types: varieties with head formation have reached harvest maturity when a head has been formed, varieties without head formation have reached harvest maturity when stems (puntarelle shoots) are formed and the leaf development is complete. The expression should be described in relation to example varieties.” (wording taken from (a)) <i>Leading Expert: I propose to maintain the current wording with a better explanation (deleting wording referring to harvest maturity): “The time of head formation is assessed by counting the number of days between the transplanting into the field and the complete head formation. The translation of these number to a state of expression of scale should be based on example varieties”</i> <i>Types with head formation are the most common types and the time of head formation is one of the most important characteristic. The explanation of characteristic “Time of head formation” is specific for head types and it corresponds, in this case, to the “time of harvest maturity”. For other chicory types the time of harvest maturity is specific for each types and it is well explained in the wording 8.1 (a)</i></p>
--------	---

(c) Changes to document TG/154/4(proj.6), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on April 3 and 4, 2017, which are to be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

Char. 16	to check wording of states of expression (state 3 doesn't correspond to illustration in TGP/14) and provide better illustrations or check whether to delete characteristic
Char. 18	to read “ <u>Only for varieties with head formation:</u> Time of head formation”
8.3	<p>improved illustrations for two types provided by Leading Expert 15. Catalogna Puntarelle</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: flex-end;"> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>Catalogna puntarelle a foglia frastagliata</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>Catalogna puntarelle di Galatina</p> </div> </div>

	<p>16. Barbe de Capucin</p>  <p>Barbe de Capucin</p>
--	---

Witloof Chicory (<i>Cichorium intybus</i> L.)	TG/173/4(proj.6)	Ms. Stéphanie Christien (FR)	TWV	*
	No. of chars.: 35 No. of (*) chars.: 19	(Interested experts: IT, NL, QZ, CropLife, ESA, ISF)		

(a) Changes to document TG/173/4(proj.5), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are already incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (document TG/173/4(proj.6)), submitted to the TC:

Cover page	to add missing SW footnote
3.1.2	to be deleted
3.5	TWV/50 report states: "to check whether to add information/explanation on bolting trials" <i>The TC-EDC agreed that no additional information is needed as enough information is provided in Chapter 8.1</i>
4.2.2	4.2.2 "open pollinated" should be "open pollinated"
4.2.3	to be deleted
4.2.4, 4.2.5	to correct spelling of "recognisable" to "recognizable"
4.2.5	in two places, a space is needed between "95%" and "should"
Char. 3	- to read "Plant: habit" - state 1 to read "upright", state 3 "semi-upright", state 5 "spreading"
Chars. 14	to check whether to read "Leaf: number of incisions of basal part" <i>Leading Expert agreed</i>
Char. 25	to add (c)
8.1 (b)	to be moved to 8.2 and to become by Ad. 4 + 5
8.1 (c)	to read "Observations should be made..."
8.1 (d), (e)	to combine (d) and (e) and to read as follows: "Observations should be made after a forcing period before exposure to daylight. At the end of the growing season, roots are harvested and the leaves are cut at about 3 cm from the attachment to the root. The roots are stored at a temperature which depends on the length of the storage and with a humidity of about 95%, before transplanting to a container in 2 repetitions of 50 roots..."
Ad. 18	to be deleted
Ad. 20	to read: "Observations should be made when the first flower opens."
Ads. 22, 23	to read "Observations should be made on the stipules of the upper third of the flowering stem."
Ad. 25	the labels "Pollen"/"no pollen" and "well-developed stamina tube"/"less developed stamina tube" should be in front of the arrows
Ad. 31, 32	to be deleted
Ad. 35	to delete "measured" and "(see (e))"
9.	2 nd reference: to replace "CTIEF" by "CTIFL"
TQ 5	to add Char. 19 (grouping char.)
TQ 6	to provide different example (no QL char.) <i>provided by Leading Expert</i>

(b) Changes to document TG/173/4(proj.5), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are not incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (TG/173/4(proj.6)), submitted to the TC, but which will be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

4.2	<p>to be numbered 4.2.1 and add new paragraph as 4.2.2 (see document TGP/7/5): “These Test Guidelines have been developed for the examination of cross-pollinated varieties, hybrids and seed propagated inbred lines. For varieties with other types of propagation the recommendations in the General Introduction and document TGP/13 “Guidance for new types and species”, Section 4.5 “Testing Uniformity” should be followed.” <i>to be approved by TWV by correspondence</i></p>									
Char. 1	<p>to check whether to read “Cotyledon: ratio width/length” with states “low”, “medium”, “high” <i>Leading Expert: The French Witloof chicory DUS examiner is in favor of the first proposition “Cotyledon: shape” with the 3 levels of expression “rounded, broad elliptic and elliptic” which are more “directly understandable” than the ratio width/length which means that “rounded” will become “high”...etc. The proposition is to keep it as it is.</i></p>									
Char. 7	<p>- to check whether to be indicated as QL - to review example varieties to be coherent in Chars. 7 and 8 <i>Leading Expert: yes, to be indicated as QL and have the following example varieties:</i></p> <p>Leaf: color</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>only green</td> <td><u>Excellence, Focus, Genie, Janus</u></td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>green and red</td> <td>Festive</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>only red</td> <td>Carla, Redoria</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </table> <p><i>to be approved by TWV by correspondence</i></p>	only green	<u>Excellence, Focus, Genie, Janus</u>	1	green and red	Festive	2	only red	Carla, Redoria	3
only green	<u>Excellence, Focus, Genie, Janus</u>	1								
green and red	Festive	2								
only red	Carla, Redoria	3								
Char. 8	<p>to check whether to be observed on varieties with red and green color only. (char. then to read “Only varieties....”) <i>Leading Expert: The French Witloof chicory DUS examiner is in favor to evaluate the general intensity of color, whatever the color is (only green, green and red, only red).Up to now, the observations made on a green and red leaf show that the 2 colors have the same intensity, therefore there is no need to precise the type of color. The proposition is to keep it as it is. To have the following example varieties</i></p> <p>Leaf: intensity of color</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>light</td> <td></td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>medium</td> <td><u>Excellence, Festive, Janus, Redoria</u></td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>dark</td> <td><u>Carla, Focus, Genie</u></td> <td>7</td> </tr> </table> <p><i>to be approved by TWV by correspondence</i></p>	light		3	medium	<u>Excellence, Festive, Janus, Redoria</u>	5	dark	<u>Carla, Focus, Genie</u>	7
light		3								
medium	<u>Excellence, Festive, Janus, Redoria</u>	5								
dark	<u>Carla, Focus, Genie</u>	7								
Char. 31	<p>- to check whether to be indicated as QL <i>Leading Expert: yes, to be indicated as QL</i> - example varieties to read as follows:</p> <p>Head: color of leaf blade</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>only yellow</td> <td><u>Flexine, Harmonie, Perfo, Takine</u></td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>yellow and red</td> <td></td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>only red</td> <td><u>Festive, Selkis</u></td> <td>3</td> </tr> </table> <p><i>to be approved by TWV by correspondence</i></p>	only yellow	<u>Flexine, Harmonie, Perfo, Takine</u>	1	yellow and red		2	only red	<u>Festive, Selkis</u>	3
only yellow	<u>Flexine, Harmonie, Perfo, Takine</u>	1								
yellow and red		2								
only red	<u>Festive, Selkis</u>	3								

Char. 32	<p>- to check whether only applies for red and yellow varieties (char. then to read “Only varieties....”) <i>Leading Expert: The French Witloof chicory DUS examiner is in favor to evaluate the general intensity of color, whatever the color is (only green, green and red, only red). Up to now, the observations made on a green and red leaf show that the 2 colors have the same intensity, therefore there is no need to precise the type of color. The proposition is to keep it as it is.</i> - example varieties to read as follows:</p> <p>Head: intensity of color of leaf blade</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;">light</td> <td style="width: 40%;">Elegance, Perfo</td> <td style="width: 30%; text-align: right;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>medium</td> <td>Baccara, <u>Harmonie</u>, Omblin, <u>Selkis</u></td> <td style="text-align: right;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>dark</td> <td>Abellis, Ecrine, <u>Festive</u>, <u>Takine</u></td> <td style="text-align: right;">7</td> </tr> </table> <p><i>to be approved by TWV by correspondence</i></p>	light	Elegance, Perfo	3	medium	Baccara, <u>Harmonie</u> , Omblin, <u>Selkis</u>	5	dark	Abellis, Ecrine, <u>Festive</u> , <u>Takine</u>	7
light	Elegance, Perfo	3								
medium	Baccara, <u>Harmonie</u> , Omblin, <u>Selkis</u>	5								
dark	Abellis, Ecrine, <u>Festive</u> , <u>Takine</u>	7								

(c) Changes to document TG/173/4(proj.6), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on April 3 and 4, 2017, which are to be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

Char. 1	state 1 to read “circular”
---------	----------------------------

Petunia (<i>Petunia</i> Juss.; x <i>Petchoa</i> J.M.H. Shaw)	TG/212/2(proj.5)	Ms. Andrea Menne (DE)	TWO	*
	No. of chars.: 34 No. of (*) chars.: 17	(Interested experts: AU, CA, CN, JP, KR, MX, NZ, QZ, ZA, CIOFORA)		

(a) Changes to document TG/212/2(proj.4), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are already incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (document TG/212/2(proj.5)), submitted to the TC:

1.1	to remove double notation of full stop sign.
1.2	to be deleted and information to be added on cover page, associated documents
4.2.2	to be deleted
5.3 (b)	Char. 3 has no more (*), to check whether to be deleted <i>Leading Expert: delete from grouping characteristics</i>
TQ 5	Char. 3 has no more (*), to check whether to be deleted <i>Leading Expert: to keep Characteristic 3 in TQ 5</i>

(b) Changes to document TG/212/2(proj.4), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are not incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (TG/212/2(proj.5)), submitted to the TC, but which will be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

1.1	to read “... <i>Petunia</i> Juss and x <i>Petchoa</i> ...” (to add “and”)
4.2	to be numbered 4.2.1 and add new paragraph as 4.2.2 (see document TGP/7/5): “These Test Guidelines have been developed for the examination of vegetatively propagated and self-pollinated seed propagated varieties. For varieties with other types of propagation the recommendations in the General Introduction and document TGP/13 “Guidance for new types and species”, Section 4.5 “Testing Uniformity” should be followed.” <i>to be approved by TWO by correspondence</i>
8.1 (a)	- applies to all characteristics (except 2 and 3) and should therefore be covered by a general explanation under 8.1. - to read “Unless otherwise indicated, observations should be made at the time of full flowering.”
TQ 1.	to place <i>Petunia</i> as 1.1.1 and x <i>Petchoa</i> as 1.2.1 (invert order of presentation)
TQ 5.7, 5.8	to indicate that the applicant should fill in either the RHS Colour Chart <u>or</u> the color group

Agaricus (<i>Agaricus bisporus</i> L.)	TG/259/2(proj.4)	Mr. Sergio Semon (QZ)	TWV	
	No. of chars.: 27 No. of (*) chars.: 19	(Interested experts: FR, HU, JP, KR, ESA, ISF)		

The TC-EDC, at its meetings held in Geneva, on January 11 and 12, 2017, and April 3 and 4, 2017, considered documents TG/259/2(proj.3) and TG/259/2(proj.4).

The TC-EDC recommended to the TC that the draft Test Guidelines for Agaricus should be referred back to the TWV for further clarification due to several technical issues concerning those draft Test Guidelines.

(a) Changes to document TG/259/2(proj.3), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are already incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines (document TG/259/2(proj.4)), submitted to the TC:

Cover page	to add missing SW footnote
General	- French translation of fruit bodies “organes fructifères” or “organs de fructification” <i>Leading Expert: the correct translation is “organes”</i> - Spanish translation of fruit bodies cuerpo frutal” or “cuerpo fructífero” <i>Leading Expert: the correct translation is “cuerpo fructífero”</i>
Char. 1	to check whether to read “Mycelium: density”
Char. 3	to read “Time of beginning of harvest”
Char. 7	to delete MG (no MG in Chars. 5 and 6)
Char. 15	to read “Only varieties with brown cap: Cap: shade of scales compared to surface”
Char. 21	to check whether to add stage 3 <i>Leading Expert: yes, to add stage 3</i>
Char. 22	to read “Time of cap opening”
Char. 26	to add (+)
Char. 27	to add (+)
8.1 (a)	to be deleted (see stage 2)
8.1 (b), (e)	indication of characteristic numbers in illustrations to be corrected
8.1 (c)	to be deleted (see stage 5)
8.1 (d)	to be deleted (see stage 3)
Ad. 3	to read “The time of beginning of harvest is reached when more than 5 fruit bodies in the first flush have reached growth stage 2.”
Ad. 7	to replace photos with drawings <i>provided by Leading Expert</i>
Ad. 21	- sample in stage 3 is missing in the test design as described in 3.4.2 <i>Leading Expert: resolved by adding stage 3 to Char. 21</i> - to correct spelling of “revealed” in last sentence

(b) Changes to document TG/259/2(proj.3), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on January 11 and 12, 2017, which are not incorporated in the draft Test Guidelines TG/259/2(proj.4)), submitted to the TC, but which will be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

General	- to clarify number of plants to be observed for Distinctness and Uniformity <i>Leading Expert: 105 fruit bodies to be observed (explanation to be found below under 3.4.2)</i> - to clarify that all observations should be made on the first flush (if more flushes, extra characteristics should be added) <i>Leading Expert: I confirm that observations should only be made in the first flush. If the current sentence in 3.1.3 “Extension of the cultivation period can be requested by the applicant if the distinctness can only be demonstrated in the second/and third flush” causes confusion, then I can agree to delete this sentence.</i>
3.1.3	- first sentence to read “The growing cycle is <u>normally</u> considered to be from spawn inoculation until the end of the first flush.” - to delete second sentence

3.4.2	<p>- Is the described test design sufficient to observe Char. 4 Time of peak of flush? <i>Leading Expert: Yes it is. Further explanation will be given in Ad.4</i></p> <p>- Additional fruit bodies have to be harvested and observed in stage 3. <i>Leading Expert: Propose 105 fruit bodies instead. The new text should read: "Each test should be designed to result in a total of at least 105 fruit bodies in the first flush, which should be divided equally over 3 replicates. 45 fruit bodies should be collected at stage 2, 15 fruit bodies should be collected at stage 3, and 45 fruit bodies should be collected at stage 5 (see chapter 8.3)"</i></p> <p>- It seems that it is not appropriate to refer to a total number of fruits in 3.4.2, at least not to such a small number. <i>Leading Expert: I don't understand the meaning of this statement, since it is standard practice in UPOV guidelines to say how many plants are observed. Hopefully the new sentence in 3.4.2 will clarify the situation.</i></p>
4.1.4	<p>According to 3.4.2 each characteristic is observed on 45 fruit bodies. There are at least 3 independent samples harvested in stage 2, 3 and 5. <i>Leading Expert: Number of fruit bodies now revised to 105 as outlined in 3.4.2 above (45+15+45)</i></p>
4.2	<p>to be numbered 4.2.1 and add new paragraph as 4.2.2 (see document TGP/7/5): "These Test Guidelines have been developed for the examination of cross-pollinated varieties. For varieties with other types of propagation the recommendations in the General Introduction and document TGP/13 "Guidance for new types and species", Section 4.5 "Testing Uniformity" should be followed."</p>
4.2.2	<p>- "cross-pollinated" to be replaced by "vegetatively" <i>Leading Expert agreed</i></p> <p>- to indicate 2 off types in a sample size of 45. <i>Leading Expert: Ok for me (stages 2 and 5). Furthermore, to indicate as well: "In the case of a sample size of 15 fruit bodies (stage 3), 1 off-type is allowed."</i></p> <p>- Is it appropriate to have 90? <i>Leading Expert: New sample size is 105 (45+15+45). Overall text for 4.2.2 should read: "For the assessment of uniformity of vegetatively propagated varieties, a population standard of 1% and an acceptance probability of 95% should be applied. In the case of a sample size of 45 fruit bodies (stages 2 and 5), 2 off-types are allowed. In the case of a sample size of 15 fruit bodies (stage 3), 1 off-type is allowed."</i></p> <p>- If a combined sample shall be considered, the size is probably 45+45+45=135. <i>Leading Expert: See explanation above</i></p>
Char. 6	<p>to check whether to have width with current states of expression or keep diameter with states "small", "medium", "large"</p>
Char. 8	<p>to check whether to be indicated as QL with states "brown" and "not brown" as Chars. 9, 10 and 15 need a QL division <i>Leading Expert: OK for me to indicate as QL with states "brown" and "not brown".</i></p>
Char. 11	<p>- How is oxidation observed? <i>Leading Expert: see Ad.11 below for a revised more detailed explanation</i></p> <p>- Will all varieties oxydate after a certain time? <i>Leading Expert: No. The typical oxidation reaction has not been observed in several varieties, such as 'Sylvan A15', 'Horst U1', etc.</i></p> <p>- is it really QL? <i>Leading Expert: Yes it is QL (see explanation above)</i></p> <p>- in the explanation check whether to indicate a fix observation time <i>Leading Expert: This has now been done in the revised explanation for Ad. 11 below</i></p>
Char. 27	<p>to check whether to be indicated as QN</p>
Ad. 4	<p>- observations seem hardly to be possible with a test design as described in 3.4.2 - to delete first sentence (already indicated in T.o.C) <i>Leading Expert: Propose a revised explanation based upon the new wording for 3.4.2: "The dates that fruit bodies have reached growth stage 2 are recorded. The time of the peak of first flush is the time at which the largest number of fruit bodies have reached this stage."</i></p>
Ad. 11	<p>How is oxidation observed? <i>Leading Expert provided revised explanation: "The stipes are cut transversally in the middle. Oxidation of the cutting edge (observed visually as a yellowish to pink to red discoloration of the cut surface) should be observed 2 to 10 minutes after cutting."</i></p>
9.	<p>Singer (1986) is missing – see Ad. 21</p>

TQ 5	to review characteristics (Chars. 4 and 13 are no grouping characteristics) <i>Leading Expert: Can agree to add Chars.4 and 13 as grouping characteristics in section 5.3</i>
------	--

Papaya (<i>Carica papaya</i> L.)	TG/264/2(proj.9)	Mr. Alejandro Barrientos-Priego (MX)	TWF	
	No. of chars.: 50 No. of (*) chars.: 21	(Interested experts: BR, CN, IL, JP, KE, MY, OM, PH, QZ, TH, VN, ZA)		

Changes to document TG/264/2(proj.9), proposed by the Enlarged Editorial Committee at its meeting on April 3 and 4, 2017, which are to be incorporated in the adopted Test Guidelines, subject to approval by the relevant TWP, if appropriate:

Cover page	English common name to read "Pawpaw" instead of "Papaw"
3.4.1	to replace "5 trees" with "5 plants"
3.4.2	to read: "In the case of seed-propagated varieties, each test should..."
4.1.4	- to replace "fruit bodies" with "plants" - to have three paragraphs: "In the case of seed-propagated varieties,..." "In the case of vegetatively propagated varieties,..." "In the case of observations of parts taken from single plants, ..."
4.2	to be numbered 4.2.1 and add new paragraph as 4.2.2 (see document TGP/7/5): "These Test Guidelines have been developed for the examination of vegetatively propagated varieties. For varieties with other types of propagation the recommendations in the General Introduction and document TGP/13 "Guidance for new types and species", Section 4.5 "Testing Uniformity" should be followed." <i>to be approved by TWV by correspondence</i>
5.3	to check whether to add Char. 23 to TQ 5
Char. 1	to check whether to provide example variety for state 5
Char. 9	state 1 to read "low", state 3 to read "high"
Char. 21	to read "Fruit of hermaphrodite plants: length"
Char. 22	to read "Fruit of hermaphrodite plants: width"
Char. 23	to read "Fruit of hermaphrodite plants: ratio length/ width"
Char. 24	to read "Fruit of female plants: length"
Char. 25	to read "Fruit of female plants: width"
Char. 26	to read "Fruit of female plants: ratio length/width"
Char. 27	to read "Fruit of hermaphrodite plants: shape"
Char. 28	to read "Fruit of female plants: shape"
Chars. 27, 28	to review order of states of expression (see grid Ad. 27, 28) and have same states of expression for both characteristics or have two separate grids
Char. 42	to read "strongly stellate" for state 4
Char. 49	to review method of observation to be consistent with explanation given in Ad. 49
8.1	to delete underlining
Ad. 18	second sentence to read "Observations should be made during the first flower opening,..."
Ad. 19	second sentence to read "Observations should be made during the first flower opening."
Ads. 27, 28	to review order of states according to TGP/14
TQ 4.2	to be completed