

Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops

Forty-Sixth Session

Hanover, Germany, June 19 to 23, 2017

TWP/1/22

Original: English

Date: June 9, 2017

Technical Working Party for Vegetables

Fifty-First Session

Roelofarendsveen, Netherlands, July 3 to 7, 2017

Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees

Fiftieth Session

Victoria, Canada, September 11 to 15, 2017

Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops

Forty-Eighth Session

Kelowna, Canada, September 18 to 22, 2017

Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs

Thirty-Fifth Session

Buenos Aires, Argentina, November 14 to 17, 2017

DEVELOPMENT OF CALCULATED THRESHOLDS FOR EXCLUDING VARIETIES OF COMMON KNOWLEDGE FROM THE SECOND GROWING CYCLE WHEN COYD IS USED

Document prepared by the Office of the Union

Disclaimer: this document does not represent UPOV policies or guidance

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The purpose of this document is to report on developments concerning the development of calculated thresholds for excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD is used.
2. The method is intended to be used with measured quantitative characteristics when COYD is used, as presented in the Annex to this document.
3. The TWPs are invited to note that further developments on calculated thresholds for excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD is used will be reported to the TWC, at its thirty-fifth session.
4. The TWC is invited to consider the report on further developments on calculated thresholds for excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD is used, to be provided by experts from the United Kingdom.
5. The structure of this document is as follows:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
BACKGROUND	2
DEVELOPMENTS IN 2016.....	2
TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY ON AUTOMATION AND COMPUTER PROGRAMS.....	2
DEVELOPMENTS IN 2017.....	2
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE AT ITS FIFTY-THIRD SESSION	2

ANNEX EXCLUDING VARIETIES OF COMMON KNOWLEDGE FROM THE SECOND GROWING CYCLE WHEN COYD IS USED

6. The following abbreviations are used in this document:

TC:	Technical Committee
TWA:	Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops
TWC:	Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs
TWF:	Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops
TWO:	Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees
TWPs:	Technical Working Parties
TWV:	Technical Working Party for Vegetables

BACKGROUND

7. The TC, at its fifty-second session, held in Geneva from March 14 to 16, 2016, considered document TC/52/3 "Matters arising from the Technical Working Parties" and received an oral report from the Chairperson of the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs (TWC) that an expert from the United Kingdom had given a presentation on "Calculated thresholds for excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD is used" (document TWC/33/20) and that the proposed methodology may be appropriate for quantitative characteristics and was an improvement on a previously described method because it took into account variability in the COYD criterion from year-to-year. The method was illustrated on a large pea data set. The expert requested more example data sets to test the methods further (see document TC/52/29 Rev. "Revised Report", paragraph 36).

8. The TC agreed to request UPOV members' experts to provide data to the United Kingdom for developing the methodology for excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD is used, as set out in paragraph 6 of document TC/52/3. The TC noted that the Office of the Union would issue a circular inviting contributions of data.

9. The TC agreed to include the development of calculated thresholds for excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD is used as an agenda item for the fifty-third session of the TC on the basis of a document to be prepared by the United Kingdom.

DEVELOPMENTS IN 2016

Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs

10. The TWC, at its thirty-fourth session, held in Shanghai, China, from June 6 to 10, 2016, noted the information presented in document TWC/34/8 "Excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD is used" (see document TWC/34/32 "Report", paragraphs 83 to 85).

11. The TWC received a presentation by an expert from the United Kingdom on "Calculated thresholds for excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD is used", a copy of which is reproduced in the Annex to document TWC/34/8 Add.

12. The TWC noted the request for submission of data sets from different crops for developing the method and welcomed the offer from Denmark, Finland, Germany and Slovakia to provide data sets. The TWC noted that software to calculate thresholds for excluding varieties would be developed to facilitate the application of the method, with a possibility to be integrated into the GAIA software.

13. On January 26, 2017, the Office of the Union was informed by the drafter from the United Kingdom that further developments would be reported to the TWC, at its thirty-fifth session, to be held in Buenos Aires, from November 14 to 17, 2017.

DEVELOPMENTS IN 2017

Technical Committee at its fifty-third session

14. The TC, at its fifty-third session, considered document TC/53/23 "Development of calculated thresholds for excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD is used".

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. A description of the method for “Excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD is used” is provided in the Annex to this document.

18. The TWPs are invited to note that further developments on calculated thresholds for excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD is used will be reported to the TWC, at its thirty-fifth session.

19. The TWC is invited to consider the report on further developments on calculated thresholds for excluding varieties of common knowledge from the second growing cycle when COYD is used, to be provided by experts from the United Kingdom.

[Annex follows]

EXCLUDING VARIETIES OF COMMON KNOWLEDGE FROM THE SECOND GROWING CYCLE WHEN
COYD IS USED

INTRODUCTION

1. When DUS tests are carried out over two or three independent growing cycles, results may be reviewed after the first cycle of testing in order to exclude varieties of common knowledge that are clearly distinct from the candidates (see document TGP/9 "Examining Distinctness"). When COYD is used to assess distinctness for a characteristic, it may be difficult to do this effectively based on experience and no formal mechanism has yet been described to inform such early decisions on distinctness.
2. In document TWC/33/20 Rev., an approach was proposed. This method was improved over previous versions by relaxation of the assumption that variety-by-cycle variation is constant from cycle to cycle. It allows for the often-seen material variation in the COYD criterion from cycle to cycle.
3. This document illustrates the application of the method to a field pea DUS data set, showing how beneficial it may be in practice.

OVERVIEW

4. The aim of this approach is to identify after the first test cycle which varieties of common knowledge are so different from the candidate that they do not need to be compared in the second cycle.
5. To achieve this, we estimate the probability that a candidate would be distinct on the 2-cycle COYD criterion from a particular variety of common knowledge, given the results from the first growing cycle. If the probability is suitably large, the candidate is declared distinct from that variety and does not need to be compared in the second cycle.
6. The method is applied characteristic by characteristic. In order to judge the variability associated with measurements in a particular characteristic we need to have historical data. The approach might be used in combination with processes such as GAIA to arrive at a "Distinctness Plus" threshold (see document TGP/8 "Trial Design and Techniques Used in the Examination of Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability", Part II: Selected Techniques Used in DUS Examination, 1 "The GAIA Methodology").

THE METHOD IN BRIEF

7. The method is based on calculating the probability, pD , that a candidate would be distinct on the 2-cycle COYD criterion based only on the first cycle's data. If the probability is suitably large, the candidate is declared distinct from that variety and does not need to be compared in the second growing cycle. This process can be inverted to identify thresholds for set probabilities.
8. As well as requiring the first cycle's trial data, the method requires historical data from past DUS trials. At least 10 cycles of trials are needed – more is better. This is used to estimate the variety-by-cycle variance for each characteristic and, importantly, its variability (or level of heterogeneity). The variety-by-cycle variance is a fundamental component of the COYD criterion (see document TGP/8 "Trial Design and Techniques Used in the Examination of Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability").
9. At the moment the method requires use of specialist statistical software to estimate the heterogeneity of the variety-by-cycle variance and the parameters of a gamma distribution. Here GenStat was used. ASREML (perhaps in combination with R) is also capable and possibly so is SAS.
10. Apart from that, the method uses formula, which whilst being a little complex, should be straightforward to implement in a program. It should not be necessary to update the thresholds every year.
11. Further detail on the method is given in document TWC/33/20 Rev. and in a paper (Roberts A.M.I., Nevison I.M., Christie T. (in press) Prediction of variety distinctness decisions under yearly heterogeneity. *Journal of Agricultural Science* doi: 10.1017/S0021859615001306).

AN EXAMPLE

12. The proposed method is exemplified using a data set from the United Kingdom field pea distinctness trials from 1995 to 2013. The semi-leafless group of varieties was considered. The trials were carried out at Science and Advice for Scottish Agriculture (SASA), near Edinburgh. Each trial had two replicates and between 139 and 290 varieties. Thirteen quantitative characteristics were considered. Only those varieties with six or more cycles of data have been retained for this study; this left 222 varieties. A 2% probability level is used for COYD.

13. Table 1 shows the characteristics considered, along with some basic statistics to give an indication of the scales. Note some of these are scored. An index for heterogeneity is included. This is based on changes in deviances between models with and without heterogeneity over cycles divided by the corresponding change in degrees of freedom: the higher the index the greater the importance of the heterogeneity. The greatest heterogeneity was found for characteristics 5 and 28. Note that the level of varietal heterogeneity in the variety-by-cycle variance (not shown) was much lower.

14. Table 2 shows the first cycle thresholds calculated for each characteristic based on setting distinctness probabilities pD at 90%, 95% and 99%. These are compared with an average COYD criterion for the two-cycle test (based on long-term data and equal to the long-term LSD). They are also compared to the tolerances based on experience that are currently used in the United Kingdom to exclude varieties of common knowledge after the first cycle.

Table 1. Characteristics considered in example data set with statistics

Characteristic (UPOV number)	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Over-cycle heterogeneity index
(5) Stem: number of nodes up to and including first fertile node	16.0	1.59	9.6	20.9	13.0
(15) Stipule: length (mm)	82.3	13.48	47.2	121.5	4.4
(16) Stipule: width (mm)	46.3	8.80	23.7	79.0	4.1
(21) Stipule: density of flecking (1-9)	5.3	0.90	2.5	8.0	4.3
(22) Petiole: length from axil to first leaflet or tendril (mm)	83.2	13.34	34.8	128.6	5.8
(28) Flower: width of standard (mm)	31.8	2.64	23.3	41.1	9.1
(29) Flower: shape of base of standard (1-9)	6.8	1.02	4.0	9.0	3.8
(34) Peduncle: length from stem to first pod (mm)	72.9	24.41	12.0	145.7	4.6
(37) Pod: length (mm)	79.1	6.24	63.3	105.6	4.3
(38) Pod: width (mm)	13.9	1.22	10.5	18.6	3.4
(42) Pod: curvature (1-9)	2.4	0.58	1.0	5.5	2.5
(46) Pod: number of ovules	8.2	0.54	6.0	10.0	7.5
(57) Seed: weight	28.1	5.19	12.2	49.1	5.7

* These characteristics are scored VG/MG and so an integer tolerance is more appropriate

Table 2. First cycle thresholds allowing for heterogeneity over cycles. For comparison, the long-term 2% COYD criterion, the current first cycle tolerances currently used by the United Kingdom based on experience and proposed new tolerances are included.

Characteristic	Long-term COYD criterion	Threshold with $p_D=0.99$	Threshold with $p_D=0.95$	Threshold with $p_D=0.9$	Current tolerance of the United Kingdom	Proposed new tolerance
5	0.93	4.13	1.81	1.39	3	4.1
15	10.80	23.38	17.90	15.70	25	23.4
16	6.95	14.18	11.15	9.87	20	14.2
21*	0.95	2.01	1.56	1.38	3	3
22	12.61	28.38	21.31	18.56	30	28.4
28	2.39	5.99	4.18	3.56	12	6.0
29*	0.93	1.96	1.54	1.37	2	2
34	19.61	45.63	33.46	28.92	40	45.6
37	5.84	12.56	9.79	8.64	20	12.6
38	0.97	2.00	1.59	1.42	2	2.0
42*	0.83	1.66	1.31	1.16	2	2
46	0.47	1.03	0.77	0.67	2	1.0
57	4.03	9.70	7.01	6.02	8	9.7

* These characteristics are scored VG/MG and so an integer tolerance is more appropriate

20. The first cycle thresholds are always larger than the COYD criterion. The degree to which they are larger depends on the degree of heterogeneity present, especially for larger values of p_D .

21. The results above are an update of those presented in TWC/33/20 Rev.. To establish the effect of using tolerances, the pea data set has been used to study the effect of first year decisions based on the existing and calculated tolerances.

22. First-year decisions were compared with COYD decisions in consecutive pairs of years (1995-96, 1996-97, 1997-98 etc.) for each characteristic. To evaluate the different thresholds, error rates were calculated:

- False positive rate: this is the proportion of times for each characteristic that the first-year threshold indicated a variety would be distinct from another variety when the subsequent second-year decision was non-distinct. This indicates the downside of taking early decisions: sometimes a pair of varieties might be declared distinct in the first year when they might later be found non-distinct. The rate of false positives is lower for higher thresholds.
- False negative rate is the proportion of times that the first-year decision was non-distinct when the second-year decision was distinct. This gives an indication of how useful the threshold might be in practice, with lower rates indicating that more pairs of varieties would be found distinct after the first year.

23. The results of this study are shown in Tables 3 and 4. These results should be interpreted with care since typically reference varieties that were clearly distinct from the candidate in at least one characteristic after the first year would have been removed from further comparisons. However the effect of this selection would be to give a pessimistic view of the performance of the calculated thresholds (false negative rates).

24. The rate of false positives was very low, especially with the existing tolerance of the United Kingdom and with the calculated threshold with p_D being 0.99. Note that it is difficult to attain a 0% false positive rate simply because the two-year COYD criterion is in itself subject to variability.

25. The usefulness of the tolerances is represented by the false negative rates. The calculated tolerances with lower values of p_D find more pairs of varieties distinct in the first year. Performance varies widely between characteristics e.g. 29, 46 and 57 have low false negative rates even with p_D being 0.99. Remember that these rates are likely to be pessimistic due to selection in the example data set.

26. Choice of a suitable p_D value for setting tolerances involves balancing the risks associated with false positives and negatives. In the case of the United Kingdom, a conservative approach has been taken. The calculated thresholds with the distinctness probability set at 0.99 had reasonable levels of false positives and false negatives. So based on the calculated thresholds with p_D at 99%, the crop expert has proposed new first year tolerances to be used in the United Kingdom field pea DUS tests with semi-leafless varieties (Table 2). Note that the tolerances for scored MG/VG characteristics (21, 29 and 42) are not based on the calculated threshold. However these calculations do give confidence in the tolerances currently used.

Table 3. Proportion of times in the United Kingdom pea data set that the first-year thresholds indicated a variety would be distinct from another variety when the subsequent COYD decision was non-distinct in the field pea data set (false positive)

Characteristic	Calculated threshold with $p_D=0.99$	Calculated threshold with $p_D=0.95$	Calculated threshold with $p_D=0.9$	Current tolerance of the United Kingdom
5	0.00%	0.05%	0.40%	0.00%
15	0.07%	0.62%	1.34%	0.04%
16	0.17%	0.79%	1.59%	0.00%
21	0.01%	0.18%	1.34%	0.00%
22	0.05%	0.41%	0.96%	0.03%
28	0.04%	0.54%	1.17%	0.00%
29	0.15%	0.15%	0.99%	0.15%
34	0.03%	0.40%	1.05%	0.07%
37	0.02%	0.23%	0.57%	0.00%
38	0.04%	0.58%	1.17%	0.05%
42	0.04%	0.56%	0.56%	0.04%
46	0.03%	0.33%	0.82%	0.00%
57	0.00%	0.23%	0.72%	0.08%

Table 4. Proportion of times in the United Kingdom pea data set that the first-year thresholds indicated a candidate variety would be non-distinct from another variety when the second-year decision was distinct in the field pea data set (false negative)

Characteristic	Calculated threshold with $p_D=0.99$	Calculated threshold with $p_D=0.95$	Calculated threshold with $p_D=0.9$	Current tolerance of the United Kingdom
5	82.8%	39.4%	24.5%	67.6%
15	86.8%	66.6%	54.3%	90.1%
16	76.8%	56.6%	46.2%	94.6%
21	81.0%	60.8%	34.6%	88.8%
22	88.5%	67.5%	54.2%	91.3%
28	89.3%	65.4%	51.7%	99.9%
29	57.3%	57.3%	34.4%	57.4%
34	84.7%	59.4%	46.2%	75.6%
37	81.2%	65.1%	54.4%	96.5%
38	77.1%	57.1%	47.4%	76.2%
42	80.9%	58.2%	58.2%	81.1%
46	66.7%	44.1%	34.2%	97.5%
57	58.5%	34.6%	25.2%	43.7%

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

27. The method proposed in TWC/33/20 Rev. has been applied to the United Kingdom field pea data set and its performance evaluated. The results show how different risks may be balanced to select an appropriate value of pD for calculating thresholds. Based on these results, the United Kingdom has now updated the first-year tolerances for pea so the tolerances now have a more transparent basis than previously. In this report we have looked at the effectiveness of the method on a characteristic-by-characteristic basis. In future we intend to examine the effect on individual variety decisions.

28. The method could also be modified to give an early indication as to whether a candidate may have distinctness problems as well as guidance on the closest reference varieties. Both of these should be of benefit to COYD users.

29. We would welcome other example data sets so that the new method can be tested on other crops. We also plan to examine software options to make implementation easier.

[End of Annex and of document]