



Disclaimer: unless otherwise agreed by the Council of UPOV, only documents that have been adopted by the Council of UPOV and that have not been superseded can represent UPOV policies or guidance.

This document has been scanned from a paper copy and may have some discrepancies from the original document.

Avertissement: sauf si le Conseil de l'UPOV en décide autrement, seuls les documents adoptés par le Conseil de l'UPOV n'ayant pas été remplacés peuvent représenter les principes ou les orientations de l'UPOV.

Ce document a été numérisé à partir d'une copie papier et peut contenir des différences avec le document original.

Allgemeiner Haftungsausschluß: Sofern nicht anders vom Rat der UPOV vereinbart, geben nur Dokumente, die vom Rat der UPOV angenommen und nicht ersetzt wurden, Grundsätze oder eine Anleitung der UPOV wieder.

Dieses Dokument wurde von einer Papierkopie gescannt und könnte Abweichungen vom Originaldokument aufweisen.

Descargo de responsabilidad: salvo que el Consejo de la UPOV decida de otro modo, solo se considerarán documentos de políticas u orientaciones de la UPOV los que hayan sido aprobados por el Consejo de la UPOV y no hayan sido reemplazados.

Este documento ha sido escaneado a partir de una copia en papel y puede que existan divergencias en relación con el documento original.

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS

GENEVA

**TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY
ON
AUTOMATION AND COMPUTER PROGRAMS****Second Session****La Minière, France, May 15 to 17, 1984**

REPORT

adopted by the Technical Working Party on
Automation and Computer Programs

Opening of the Session

1. The second session of the Technical working Party on Automation and Computer Programs (hereinafter referred to as "the Working Party") was held in La Minière, France, from May 15 to 17, 1984. The List of Participants appears in Annex I to this report.
2. Mr. Hutin, Director of the Groupe d'étude et de contrôle des variétés et des semences (GEVES) at La Minière, welcomed the participants to his office. The session was opened by Mrs. V. Silvey, Chairman of the Working Party.

Adoption of the Agenda

3. The Working Party adopted the agenda as reproduced in document TWC/II/1 after having agreed to discuss under "Any other business" the question of minimum distances.

Adoption of the Report of the First Session

4. The Working Party unanimously adopted the report of its first session as appearing in document TWC/I/4.

Report on the Nineteenth Session of the Technical Committee

5. Dr. M.-H. Thiele-Wittig reported on the previous session of the Technical Committee, restricting himself to the main subjects of interest to the Working Party. The full report of that session is reproduced in document TC/XIX/5.
6. Dr. Thiele-Wittig repeated to the Working Party that, according to a decision taken by the Technical Committee, each expert in any of the various Technical Working Parties should receive copies of the reports of the Technical Committee and all the other Technical Working Parties in order to keep him informed of the work going on in those bodies. The distribution of the reports would take place through the representative of the member State concerned in

the Technical Committee. Experts who had not yet received reports were therefore advised to request them from their representatives in the Technical Committee, who on request would be supplied with sufficient copies by the Office of UPOV. Other documents concerning a given Technical Working Party would be distributed by the Office of UPOV directly. For that purpose the Office of UPOV had established a distribution list according to the information received from member States. The present distribution list for the members of the Working Party is reproduced in Annex II to this report.

Over-Years Analysis for the Testing of Distinctness

7. Dr. Weatherup introduced document TWC/II/5, which contained a description and evaluation of the combined over-years criterion for distinctness between varieties of herbage crops.

8. During the discussions that followed the introduction, the Working Party reaffirmed its position taken during the last session, to the effect that, from the statistical point of view, the combined over-years analysis was the more appropriate method compared with the present UPOV distinctness criteria. During the previous year, however, when the combined over-years analysis had been compared with the present UPOV criteria, several practical questions had arisen which would require clarification before the Working Party could recommend that the Technical Committee replace the present criteria with the combined over-years analysis. It therefore agreed that, for the coming session of the Technical Committee, only a document on the technical aspects should be prepared. That document would comprise document TWC/II/5 prepared by Dr. Weatherup, supplemented by an introduction giving in simpler, non-statistical terms the main reasons for which, from the statistical point of view, a change from the present UPOV criteria to the combined over-years analysis would be recommended.

9. In the meantime the experts would prepare short summaries of the questions that had arisen and the difficulties that had been encountered with the application of the combined over-years analysis in their countries and hand them to their representatives in the Technical Committee in order to prepare the latter for the discussions at the next Technical Committee session. The summaries would also be sent to Dr. Weatherup, who would collate the information received in a document for the next session of the Working Party. The summaries should as far as possible also mention solutions to the difficulties encountered.

10. During the discussions it became clear that at present the procedure adopted in the various member States for the evaluation of distinctness differed somewhat. For example, while in most of the member States the plot mean was the basic unit for the statistical calculation (ANOVA) some countries used the individual plant instead. This difference in application led to differences in the results of comparison of the criteria. In one case the number of varieties that could be distinguished by means of combined over-years analysis was much smaller than when the present UPOV criteria were applied.

11. The Working Party agreed that there was no statistical justification for taking variation within the plots into account, as the plants within the plots were not randomized. Use of the variation within the plots would artificially increase the degrees of freedom and would, in general, provide an easier test of distinctness than if plot means were used. The basic unit for calculation should be the plot mean and not the individual plant.

12. It was mentioned by several experts that, whichever system was used, it would not be acceptable, from a practical point of view, for a change from one system to another to change considerably the number of varieties that could be distinguished. This was unacceptable both to the authorities and to the breeders. It would therefore be necessary to study further why the change in method led to the differences, and how they could be overcome. Better continuity in the number of distinctness decisions might be achieved by, for example, adopting a probability level of 5% rather than 1%.

13. In order to obtain more information on the various procedures applied at present in member States, and to enable a study to be made on whether some of the differences arising from comparison of the within-year and over-year methods resulted in differences not immediately connected with that comparison, the Working Party agreed that each expert would prepare an example of the procedure applied at present in his State. For that purpose the United Kingdom would select and circulate, via the Office of UPOV, data on ten varieties. The experts from France would then prepare a survey of all the individual examples of the analyses applied in each country.

14. The following items were mentioned as requiring special attention when the present UPOV criteria were compared with the combined over-years analysis: the possible disadvantage in cases where differences between varieties in certain characteristics (for example the date of ear emergence) in different years showed the same sign but varied considerably from one year to the next; the possible need to set a limit on the heterogeneity of control varieties, because the combined over-years criterion does not sufficiently allow for this heterogeneity and there could consequently be a lowering of the threshold and too many distinctness decisions made; finally, the question of how to reach a decision after only two years (which was possible with the present UPOV criteria).

Methods Used for the Testing of Homogeneity of Cross-Fertilized Plants

15. Dr. Weatherup introduced his paper "The Homogeneity Criterion: A Comparison Between the United Kingdom and the UPOV Criteria" as reproduced in document TWC/II/3. In the ensuing discussions it became apparent that, apart from the differences between the two methods and apart from the fact that the UPOV method did not take account of the variation of standard deviations of the control varieties, the main problem in the testing of homogeneity was that the selection of the groups of control varieties with which the candidate varieties were compared differed widely between the various member States. In some member States all control varieties were used for the comparison of all characteristics, and only the very extreme, non-homogeneous varieties were excluded for certain characteristics, while in other member States subgroups were formed according to certain breeding methods, breeding purposes, botanical types or uses, etc. Still others would prepare, for each characteristic, a separate group of control varieties with which the candidate varieties would be compared.

16. The Working Party realized that, when candidate varieties were compared with a large set of control varieties, there was a risk of the homogeneity requirements being reduced and more and more heterogeneous varieties having to be accepted. The main aim would therefore be to look for means of obtaining groups of more homogeneous controls with which candidate varieties would be compared. Thus, groups could be formed according to different considerations, for example breeding methods, breeding purposes, botanical types or uses and inside those groups certain statistical methods could be applied to help select the more homogeneous varieties. The varieties could, for instance, be listed according to their variance and a check could be made on whether natural groups existed; alternatively, starting from the lowest end, varieties might only be chosen up to the point where the variety in question was no longer considered homogeneous. The Bartlett test or the analysis of variance of standard deviations could be used for that purpose.

17. The Working Party was of the opinion that it was not worth proceeding further with harmonizing the statistical method of assessing homogeneity until the selection of groups of control varieties used by the various member States to test homogeneity had themselves been harmonized more.

18. The Working Party agreed that for its next session the experts would consider possible botanical and other ways to achieve groups of more homogeneous control varieties and initiate discussions with non-statistical colleagues on the possibility of harmonizing the grouping procedures between member States. In addition, an expert from the United Kingdom would prepare a short paper explaining how the analysis of variance of standard deviations was applied to the testing of homogeneity.

Standardization of Entries

19. Mr. Duyvendak (Netherlands) introduced document TWC/II/4, which contained an analysis of the content of the different lists of varieties under test exchanged between UPOV member States. He mentioned that it had been difficult to achieve harmonization of the layout and content of the various lists and that, because of the importance of starting to distribute the lists, the Technical Committee had agreed to exchange the lists regardless of their different layout and content.

20. It was generally held that, in view of the above fact and also the fact that often the lists exchanged were prepared for different purposes or had to serve several purposes, it would not be possible to achieve full harmonization between member States. In order to take one step towards harmonization, however, the Working Party recommended that all lists should at least contain certain minimum information. After checking the various items it proposed as a minimum items 1 to 6, 12, 18, 19, 22 and 23 of document TWC/II/4 (list of contents, identification of each page by name of country, date of list, page number, heading and Latin name of species; breeder's reference; plant breeders' rights application number and date; year of test for plant breeders' rights; indication whether tests executed for another country, with their reference number; indication whether tests executed in another country, with their reference number). In addition the Working Party considered it useful for the lists to contain information on items 20 and 21 (application number and date for national listing and year of test for national listing) and also item 24 (conclusions of previous year).

21. The expert from the Netherlands would prepare an updated version of the table reproduced in document TWC/II/4 for the next session of the Working Party.

22. It was recalled that each member State received from most of the other member States that undertook tests two copies of the lists of varieties under test. The main purpose of distributing two copies was so that one copy might be stored centrally in the member State while the second would be broken down according to species, the relevant parts being sent to the experts responsible for the testing of the species concerned. The experts in individual member States would thus be able to secure information on whether a given candidate variety had already been tested or was undergoing testing in another member State.

23. Annex III to this report contains a copy of the list of addresses of Offices receiving lists of varieties under test as well as a copy of a list of addresses of Offices mailing such lists.

Checking of Variety Denominations

24. Mr. Royer (France) introduced his proposal for a standardized list of variety denominations, as reproduced in Annex IV to this report. The proposal was based on the modular system. Page 4 of the proposal specified certain minimum data that each member State would have to supply, while page 5 provided some historical information and pages 6 and 7 explained the codes used.

25. The Working Party was aware that the question of the checking of variety denominations had been discussed at the previous sessions of the Administrative and Legal Committee, and that the United Kingdom had offered to check variety denominations for chrysanthemum on behalf of all other UPOV member States that might wish to participate, while the Federal Republic of Germany had offered to check variety denominations of *Elatior begonia* for all other UPOV member States. As the above checking and exchange of information was intended to use a paper medium, while the proposal mentioned earlier was for the study of the possibilities for a paperless data exchange, it was not considered that there was any conflict or duplication of work between the two projects.

26. The proposal for a standardized list of variety denominations had been distributed to the members of the Working Party only shortly before the session. It was therefore considered that more time was required for detailed study of the paper, and agreed that each expert would send his comments to Mr. Royer before the end of June 1984, whereupon Mr. Royer would apply his proposal to the barley varieties to be included in the next French Official Gazette. A magnetic tape with the resulting information would be sent to the experts of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom, who would try to use the data directly from the tape. Their comments and all experience gained would be summarized by the French expert in a paper for the next session of the Working Party. The example of barley varieties to be published in the next French Official Gazette was chosen because one of the practical uses of the French proposal could be the immediate paperless transmission of the varieties to be published in official gazettes. That procedure could spare Offices the wait for publication of individual gazettes. The Working Party decided on the direct application of the proposal

to a given example in the knowledge that it would still be necessary to introduce a number of rules, and also that several of the data--for example the priority date--would be given different meanings in the various member States. It was considered that to wait until all data had been harmonized was not reasonable and that an immediate trial application of the proposal would afford the most information on its usefulness and on any amendments that might prove necessary.

Description of Varieties

27. Mr. Law (United Kingdom) explained his preliminary table containing a summary of the replies received to a questionnaire on variety descriptions. An amended version of the summary table, containing some corrections and additional information received after the session, is reproduced in Annex V to this report. Annex V also contains a summary of the results of the above-mentioned table. Under item (ii) of that summary the expert proposed the harmonization of format and presentation, which at present varied from crop to crop within a country as well as from country to country.

28. The Working Party came to the conclusion that, with respect to their format and presentation, it should be considered that the tables might be put to different uses, namely for the description of varieties for publication purposes on the one hand and for technical experts on the other. For publication purposes a description would be presented mainly in the form of words, while technical experts would be interested mainly in a more detailed description, including for example the scores of various expressions. The experts of the Working Party were therefore invited not only to prepare comments on the United Kingdom proposal, notably regarding the format and the contents of items to be included in the list and its compatibility with the UPOV Model Form for a Report on Technical Examination, but also to give any other information they considered useful. Mr. Law would prepare a summary of the comments for discussion during the next session of the Working Party. The experts were also invited to comment on the other proposals under (ii) and (iii) of the summary in Annex V to this report (areas where agreement may be possible and outstanding problems respectively).

29. Mr. Law (United Kingdom) introduced two further papers illustrating that even within one country differences in descriptions occurred according to the different species dealt with.

Report on Progress Made with the Integration of Files

30. The Working Party considered the question of the integration of files to be a general problem which was already covered by some of the other items of the agenda of its second session.

Inventory of Data Bases and Their Structure

31. The Working Party noted the information reproduced in documents TWC/II/2 and TWC/II/2 Add. It also noted corrections to Annex I of document TWC/II/2, where for the Federal Republic of Germany, on page 1, the figure 179 should be replaced by 110 and the figures 60 to 100 by 179, while on page 2 the program language "FORTRAN" should be "FORTRAN 77"; for Denmark, on page 2, the main computer should be an "IBM 3081," the program language "FORTRAN" should be "FORTRAN 66 and 77," the stored format "Binary," the normal access mode "Batch," the number of species "34" and the years of data directly accessible "up to 10;" for France, England and Scotland the program language "FORTRAN" should be "FORTRAN 66 and 77." In addition it was mentioned that in Spain the present program language was "COBOLT" but that there were plans to introduce "FORTRAN 77," and that in the Netherlands "FORTRAN 77" was the program language used.

Intercommunication Network

32. Mr. Talbot (United Kingdom) introduced document TWC/II/6, which contained information on computer communication networks for the exchange of variety information. In the ensuing discussions it became apparent that so far only Scotland was directly connected to a national network and England and Wales

via a university, while in France a connection was expected for September or October 1984. In Northern Ireland a connection could be expected in one or two years' time while in the other member States represented at the session there were no plans for a connection in the near future. In the Netherlands it was not even planned at all. The main reason for this situation lay in the fact that the proposition was a rather costly one, and in several cases it would require expensive software and even hardware before the computers could be connected to the national data network. The UPOV Office so far had no computer but could receive information via the computer links of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), thanks to the latter's association with the International Computing Center of the United Nations in Geneva, which itself had connections with the Swiss national network.

33. With regard to the possibility of using electronic mail between the offices of the various member States, it was agreed that each expert would study what links were possible in his country, what costs there would be if for example the national gazette was distributed by electronic mail to the other 16 member States, and what costs there would be if the national gazettes of the other 16 member States were received in that way. The experts of the United Kingdom would prepare a summary of those studies for the next session of the Working Party. The information sent to the United Kingdom experts should also include details of the various national offices, intentions to use either the national network or electronic mail. The experts were alerted to the possible legal problem regarding copyright, especially in relation to software bought from outside and not developed in the offices themselves.

34. The checking of the proposals for a standardized list of variety denominations, as mentioned under the heading "Checking of variety denominations" (see paragraphs 24 to 26), would serve as a practical example for the study on the possibilities of the future linking the computer centers of the national offices via a national data communication network.

Exchange of Software

35. Mr. Talbot (United Kingdom) introduced document TWC/II/7, which provided information on the exchange of software. The Working Party agreed on the three recommendations mentioned in that paper, namely that all new software that was developed should be produced with the view to its being shared with other centers, that as far as possible software should be developed in the languages and dialects recognized by the Working Party, and that a modular program structure should be used with likely machine-dependent features clearly separated from other operations.

36. To facilitate the exchange, international documentation standards should also be used. As the United Kingdom had established a documentation standard for its own purposes, it would circulate a copy of that standard to the experts of the other member States for information. Comments on the standard should be sent by the end of the year to the experts of the United Kingdom, who would prepare a summary of them for discussion during the next session of the Working Party.

37. As it had become apparent that more and more micro-computers were being used by offices in recent years, it was considered necessary to prepare standards for micro-computers also. Mrs. Campbell (United Kingdom) would prepare a questionnaire on automatic data recording devices and links between those devices and micro-computers by the end of July, and would collect answers by the end of October with a view to the preparation of a summary for the next session of the Working Party.

38. Mr. Talbot also introduced document TWC/II/8, which contained information on computer software for crop variety performance testing in the United Kingdom. This information was considered extremely useful and it was agreed that other member States should also prepare similar papers. For a start, Mr. Royer (France) would prepare a summary on the French system by the end of the year.

Weighted Evaluation

39. Mr. Leclerc introduced a paper on the method of assessing maize varieties a the view to registration in the French catalogue, which is reproduced in

Annex VI to this report. The paper explained the various indices used to weigh the range of characteristics used to determine whether a given variety had sufficient cultural value to be included in the French catalogue. The indices used in France for maize were not based on statistical techniques but decided by policy officers in order to give a certain characteristic a particular weight in the assessment of cultural value. Different procedures were used in France for other crops, including for instance a system of bonus points and penalty points for cereals.

40. During the discussions the Working Party was informed that a similar system was applied in the Federal Republic of Germany but that it was more open; in the Netherlands no fixed system would be established in advance, but the Committee deciding on the cultural value was free to update the system on the spot; in Denmark a different system was used depending on the species concerned, so that for tomato, for instance, earliness would be given different grades which then would be used for the evaluation of the cultural value; in the United Kingdom a new system was being developed but had not yet been completed.

Future Program, Date and Place of Next Session

41. The Working Party agreed to hold its third session at Wageningen, Netherlands, from May 8 to 10, 1985. The meeting would start at 9 a.m. on May 8 and close at 1 p.m. on May 10, 1985. The experts from the Federal Republic of Germany offered to host the Working Party in Hanover in 1986. During its 1985 session, the Working Party would continue discussions or start new discussions on the following items:

- (i) **Over-Years Analysis**
((a) All the experts will inform Dr. Weatherup in detail by the end of September of the application of the over-years analysis in their countries and on difficulties encountered; Dr. Weatherup will prepare a document for circulation via the UPOV Office by the end of February; (b) Dr. Weatherup will prepare a summary of the procedure currently applied in the United Kingdom by the end of June, choosing as an example one characteristic of ten varieties, which will be circulated to the member States via the Office of UPOV; member States will be requested to send to Mr. Royer, by the end of July, an explanation of the analysis applied in their countries using as a basis the same data on the ten varieties as had been chosen in the United Kingdom example; Mr. Royer will prepare a summary by the end of September to be circulated via the Office of UPOV.)
- (ii) **Testing of Homogeneity in Cross-fertilized Plants**
(Possibilities for harmonizing the grouping of control varieties will be studied by each of the experts; Mr. Talbot will prepare a short paper explaining the application of the analysis of variance of standard deviations to the testing of homogeneity.)
- (iii) **Standardization of Entries**
(Mr. Duyvendak will prepare a new updated table on the items included in the lists of varieties under test (TWC/II/4).)
- (iv) **Checking of Variety Denominations**
(Each member State will send its comments on the paper presented by Mr. Royer (Annex IV) to Mr. Royer by the end of June; by the end of September Mr. Royer will prepare a tape with all barley varieties that will be published in the next French Official Gazette, made up according to the structure described in his document, and send it to the experts from the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom); comments on the tape will be sent by January 1985 to Mr. Royer, who by March 1985 will prepare a summary to be circulated via the Office of UPOV.)
- (v) **Description of Varieties**
(Each member State will send proposals on Annex V of this document by the end of September to Mr. Law, who will prepare a summary of them.)

- (vi) **Intercommunication Network**
(The experts of each member State will enquire at home as to what links are possible in their countries and what the cost would be of distributing the national gazette to the other 16 member States and also of receiving national gazettes from the other 16 member States; they will convey that information, together with information on the office's intentions regarding use of the national network, to Mr. Talbot by the end of September.)
- (vii) **Exchange of Software**
(a) Comments on the document on United Kingdom documentation standards, to be received from Mr. Talbot via the Office of UPOV, will be sent back to Mr. Talbot by the end of the year; (b) comments on the questionnaire on automatic data recording devices and links between these devices for micro-computers, to be prepared by Miss Campbell by the end of July, will be sent to Miss Campbell by the end of October; (c) Mr. Royer will describe the French computer software for crop variety performance testing by the end of the year in the same way as was done for the United Kingdom in document TWC/II/8.
- (viii) **Questions raised by other UPOV Technical Working Parties**
(Discussions will depend on the questions raised.)

Any Other Business

42. The Working Party noted the information contained in documents IOM/I/3, IOM/I/11 and CAJ/XIII/2 on the question of minimum distances between varieties. It considered the questions to be mainly or in the first instance within the jurisdiction of the Technical Working Parties dealing with individual crops. Once the decisions had been taken by those Working Parties, the Working Party would if necessary come back to the question.

Report from Belgium

43. Mr. Ermens (Belgium) reported that in a few months' time Belgium would, as a first step, start setting up a system of files for the processing of applications for plant variety protection, as a second step embark on the verification of the contents of the files and as a third step introduce the payment of fees for the maintenance of plant variety protection rights. He asked the Working Party to help Belgium with the constitution of the above documentation.

Basic Reading List

44. Having noted that other Technical Working Parties were currently in the process of drawing up lists of reference books and documents useful in the testing of varieties, the Working Party also considered it worth while to draw up such a basic reading list. It therefore asked the experts of the member States to supply the Office of UPOV with books they regarded as forming part of their national basic reading list. The information received by the Office of UPOV by the end of July is reproduced in Annex VII to this report. The Working Party further agreed that it would study, on the basis of that list, the possibilities for preparing a more complete list grouped by certain subjects that still had to be decided upon, for example distinctness, homogeneity, etc. The list should in future also contain comments on the most relevant chapters and the main tables. It should cover literature in all languages and should not confine itself to English or to the official UPOV languages alone.

Presentation of Papers for the Working Party

45. The Working Party agreed that in future it would observe the rule that papers produced for it should repeat on each page the source and the date of the paper and also, if relevant to the data concerned, specify the date or year to which the data applied.

Visits

46. On the morning of the second day of their session, the experts of the Working Party visited the trial fields and the computer unit of the Groupe d'étude et de contrôle des variétés et des semences (GEVES) at La Minière, where it received a detailed explanation on the testing of varieties and on the processing of the individual data received during testing.

47. This report, in absence of any suggestions for modifications, is considered as adopted, in accordance with Rule 37(5) of the Rules of Procedure of the Council.

[Seven Annexes follow]

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

SECOND SESSION OF THE
TECHNICAL WORKING PARTY ON AUTOMATION AND COMPUTER PROGRAMS
LA MINIERE, FRANCE, MAY 15 TO 17, 1984I. MEMBER STATESBELGIUM

Mr. A. ERMENS, Ingénieur principal, 36, Rue de Stassart, 1050 Bruxelles
(tel. 02/513.84.11)

DENMARK

Mr. K. KRISTENSEN, Dataanalytisk Laboratorium, Lottenborgvej 24, 2800 Lyngby
(tel. 02 870631)

FRANCE

Mr. M. SIMON, Secrétaire général, Comité de la protection des obtentions
végétales, Ministère de l'agriculture, 17, avenue de Tourville,
75007 Paris (tel. 0033 1 555 9107)

Mr. C. HUTIN, Directeur de recherches, INRA/GEVES, La Minière,
78280 Guyancourt (tel. 033 3 043 8113)

Miss M.C. BIGE, INRA/GEVES, La Minière, 78280 Guyancourt
(tel. 0033 3 043 8113)

Miss F. BLOUET, INRA/GEVES, La Minière, 78280 Guyancourt (tel. 03-043-81-13)

Mr. R. BRAND, INRA/GEVES, Domaine d'Olonne, B.P. 1, Les Vignères,
84300 Cavaillon (tel. 090 712 685)

Mr. P. GAUTHIER, INRA/GEVES, La Minière, 78280 Guyancourt
(tel. 0033-3 043-8113)

Mr. J. GUIARD, INRA/GEVES, La Minière, 78280 Guyancourt
(tel. 0033-3 043-8113)

Mr. CH. LECLERC, INRA/GEVES, La Minière, 78280 Guyancourt
(tel. 0033-3 043 8113)

Mr. F. ROYER, Unité de calcul, INRA/GEVES, La Minière, 78280 Guyancourt
(tel 0033 3 043 8113)

GERMANY, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF

Dr. G. FUCHS, Bundessortenamt, Osterfelddamm 80, 3000 Hannover 61,
(tel. 0511 57041)

Dr. F. LAIDIG, Bundessortenamt, Osterfelddamm 80, 3000 Hannover 61,
(tel. 0511 57041)

NETHERLANDS

- Mr. R. DUYVENDAK, Botanical Research, Agricultural Crops, RIVRO, P.B. 32, 6700 AA Wageningen (tel. 08370-19056)
- Mr. A.M. VAN DER BURGT, RIVRO, P.B. 32, 6700 AA Wageningen, (tel. 08370-19056)

SPAIN

- Mr. M. DEL FRESNO ALVAREZ-BUYLLA, Registro de Variedades, INSPV, 56, José Abascal, 28003 Madrid (tel. 01-4418199)
- Mr. L.M. DE VILLENA, Instituto de Relaciones Agrarias, 56, José Abascal, 28003 Madrid (tel. 01-4428211)

SWEDEN

- Mr. S. MEJEGÅRD, President of Division of the Court of Appeal, Armfelts-gatan 4, 115 34 Stockholm (tel. 08-633460)

SWITZERLAND

- Dr. W. GFELLER, Leiter des Büros für Sortenschutz, Bundesamt für Landwirtschaft, Mattenhofstrasse 5, 3003 Bern (tel. 031 612586)

UNITED KINGDOM

- Mrs. A. CAMPBELL, National Institute of Agricultural Botany, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LE (tel. 0223 276381)
- Mr. J.R. LAW, National Institute of Agricultural Botany, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LE (tel. 0223 276381)
- Mrs. V. SILVEY, National Institute of Agricultural Botany, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LE (tel. 0223 276381)
- Mr. M. TALBOT, Agricultural and Food Research Council (AFRUS), Unit of Statistics, University of Edinburgh, Kings Building, West Mains Road, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ (tel. 031 667 1081)
- Dr. S.T.C. WEATHERUP, Agriculture and Food Science Centre, Biometrics Division, Department of Agriculture for Northern Ireland (DANI), Newforge Lane, Belfast BT9 5PX, (tel. 0232 661166)

II. OFFICER

- Mrs. V. SILVEY, Chairman

III. OFFICE OF UPOV

- Dr. M.-H. THIELE-WITTIG, Senior Counsellor, 34, chemin des Colombettes, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland (tel. 022 999152)

[Annex II follows]

T 6Distribution ListTECHNICAL WORKING PARTY
ON AUTOMATION AND COMPUTER PROGRAMS(all TWC documents)
(if not indicated otherwise, 1 copy each)T 6 a: Member States

Mr. A. Ermens, Bruxelles Mr. R. D'Hoogh, Bruxelles	Belgium
Mr. F. Espenhain, Skaelskør Mr. K. Kristensen, Lyngby Plantenyhedsnaevnet, Skaelskør	Denmark
Mr. C. Hutin, Guyancourt Mr. F. Royer, Guyancourt	France
Dr. G. Fuchs, Hannover Dr. F. Laidig, Hannover	Germany (Federal Republic of)
Dr. J. Berko, Budapest Dr. J. Koncz, Budapest Dr. G. Pusztai, Budapest Dr. B. Szaloczy, Budapest	Hungary
Mr. D. Feeley, Dublin Mr. P. O'Leary, Dublin	Ireland
Mr. B. Bar-Tel, Bet Dagan Dr. M. Hoffman, Bet Dagan Mr. M.M. Shaton, Genève	Israel
Istituto Agronomico per l'Oltremare, Florence Dr. B. Palestini, Rome Prof. L. Quagliotti, Torino Prof. S. Samperi, Rome Dr. L. Zangara, Rome	Italy
Mr. T. Ishiki, Tokyo Mr. T. Kato, Genève Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Mr. M. Nakamura, Tokyo Mr. M. Tsuchiyama, Tokyo	Japan (2 copies)
Mr. R. Duyvendak, Wageningen Mr. A.M. van der Burgt, Wageningen	Netherlands
Mr. P. Baigent, London Mr. F.W. Whitmore, Lincoln	New Zealand

T 6 a (contd.)

Dr. J. Le Roux, Paris	South Africa
Dr. A.D. Nieuwoudt, Pretoria	

Mr. J.M. Elena Rossello, Madrid	Spain
Mr. M. del Fresno, Madrid	
Mr. M. Villena, Madrid	

Prof. L. Kåhre, Solna	Sweden
Mr. S. Mejegård, Stockholm	
Statens växtsortnämnd, Solna	

Dr. W. Gfeller, Berne	Switzerland
Mr. R. Guy, Nyon	

Mrs. A. Campbell, Cambridge	United Kingdom
Dr. K. Doodson, Cambridge	
Mr. F.H. Goodwin, Cambridge	
Mr. S. Graham, Cambridge	
Mr. A.G. Hampson, Cambridge	
Mr. J.R. Law, Cambridge	
Mr. D.J. Mossop, Cambridge	
Mrs. V. Silvey, Cambridge	
Mr. M. Talbot, Edinburgh	
Dr. S.T.C. Weatherup, Belfast	
Mr. P. Winfield, Edinburgh	

Commissioner of Patents, Washington	United States of America
Mr. K.H. Evans, Beltsville	
Mr. S.D. Schlosser, Washington	

T 6 b: Non-Member States

Mr. W. Bradnock, Ottawa	Canada
-------------------------	--------

Mr. S. Aguilar Yopez, Mexico City	Mexico
Mr. A. Gonzales Sanchez, Mexico City	

[Annex III follows]

LIST OF ADDRESSES FOR THE MAILING OF LISTS OF VARIETIES UNDER TEST

(as of June 5, 1984)

BELGIUM/BELGIQUE/BELGIEN

M. J. RIGOT, Ingénieur en chef-directeur, Ministère de l'agriculture,
36, rue de Stassart, B-1050 Bruxelles

DENMARK/DANEMARK/DÄNEMARK

Mr. F. ESPENHAIN, Head of Office, Plantenyhedsnaevnet, Tystofte,
DK-4230 Skaelskør

FRANCE/FRANKREICH

Secretariat du C.T.P.S., GEVES/INRA, La Minière, F-78280 Guyancourt
(téléphone: (3) 04381.13,; telex: INRAM 698.450 F)

GERMANY (FED. REP. OF)/ALLEMAGNE (REP. FED. D')/DEUTSCHLAND (BUNDESREPUBLIK)

Dr. D. BÖRINGER, Präsident, Bundessortenamt, Osterfelddamm 80,
D-3000 Hannover 61

HUNGARY/HONGRIE/UNGARN

Dr. B. SZALOCZY, Institute for Plant Production and Qualification, Ministry
of Agriculture and Food, P.O. Box 93, H-1525 Budapest 114

IRELAND/IRLANDE/IRLAND

Mr. D. FEELEY, Department of Agriculture, Agriculture House, Dublin 2

ISRAEL

Mr. B. BAR-TEL, Ministry of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Organization,
The Volcani Center, P.O.B. 6, Bet Dagan 50250

ITALY/ITALIE/ITALIEN*

Ministero dell'Agricoltura e delle Foreste, Direzione Generale della
Produzione Agricola, Div. II - Servizio registrazioni varietà prodotti
vegetali, Via Sallustiana, 10, I-00187 Roma

JAPAN/JAPON/JAPAN*

Mr. M. TSUCHIYAMA, Director, Seeds and Seedlings Division, Agricultural
Production Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries,
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

NETHERLANDS/PAYS-BAS/NIEDERLANDE

The Director, RIVRO, P.O.B. 32, NL-6700 AA Wageningen

Service Informatique

page 6

Signification des codes des Suivis de Dossier
Codes meanings for Attendance of Record

	Germany	France	Great-Britain
codification des evenements :			codes for events:
(1) Denomination	Sortenbezeichnung	Denomination	Denomination
	DEPD prioritatsdatum	deposee	applied
	PROD vorgeschlagen	proposee	proposed
	APPD	approuvee	approved
	REJD	rejete	rejected
	MDD	modifiee	terminated
	DISD	approuvee et disponible	approved and available
	ASYD	synonyme	approved
	AFFD	approuve	synonym
		affectation de denomination	attribution of denomination <i>attributed country</i>
(2) Variete			
PROTECTION	SHUTZEINTRAGUNG	PROTECTION	PROTECTION
	DEMP	demande	application
	ACCP	accord	agreement
	REFP	refus	refusal
	ABAP	abandon	
	DECP schutzlaschung	decheance	deletion of grant
NATIONAL LIST	Listeinstragung	INSCRIPTION	REGISTRATION
	DEMI anmeldung	demande	application
	ACCI	accord	agreement
	REFI	refus	refusal
	ABAI	retrait	withdrawal
	RADI listenloeschung	radiee	deletion
Organisme responsable de l'evenement :			
	DEMA anmelder	demandeur	applicant
	SNAP	service nat. de la protection	national service of protection
	SNAI	service nat. de l'inscription	national service of registration

Service Informatique

page 7

Signification des codes des Suivis de Dossier (suite)
Codes meanings for Attendance of Record (follow)

	Germany	France	Great-Britain
Publication :			
(1) nature			
NALT		catalogue national	national list
COLT		catalogue commun	common list
OECD		liste OCDE	OECD liste
...G		gazette nationale	national gazette
(2) numero 6 chiffres		numero d'edition	edition number 6 figures
(3) date an/mm/jj 6 chiffres		date de parution	date of publication
Statut du tiers :			Third Status :
DEMA		demandeur	applicant
OBTR	behoerde	obteneur	breeder
MAIN		mainteneur	maintainer
REPT		representant	representative
ADRT		ayant droit	beneficiary
SUTI		successeur en titre	successor in title
CDEM		co-demandeur	co-applicant
COBT		co-obteneur	co-breeder
COMT		co-mainteneur	co-maintener

[Annex V follows]

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON CURRENT PRODUCTION/USE OF VARIETY DESCRIPTIONS. MINORITY RESPONSE IN BRACKETS
(COLLATED BY J LAW, NIAB, UK)

	UK	UK	UK	UK	JAPAN	SPAIN	FRANCE	GERMANY	DENMARK	DENMARK	SOUTH AFRICA	HUNGARY	EIRE	EIRE	
	CEREALS	GRASSES	VEGETABLES	ROOT/RAPE ETC					GRASS/CEREALS	VEG/RAPE ETC			HERBAGE	CEREALS	
I. SOURCE OF DATA (i) DIRECTLY FROM STORED DATA (ii) AS (i) BUT SOME EXTRA INPUT (iii) ALL DATA RE-INPUT (iv) DESCRIPTIONS CLERICALLY PRODUCED (FROM VARIOUS SOURCES)	NO NO(YES)	NO NO	NO(YES) NO(YES)	NO NO	YES NO	} MIXED SYSTEM	} MIXED SYSTEM	NO NO	NO YES	NO NO	NO NO	NO NO	NO NO	NO NO	NO NO
	NO YES	NO YES*	NO YES	NO YES	NO NO			NO NO	NO YES*	NO NO	NO YES	NO YES	NO YES	NO YES	NO YES
		*FROM TABULATIONS						FROM TABULATIONS							
II. DATA MANIPULATION (i) HOW ARE QUALITATIVE CHARACTERISTICS HANDLED? (ii) HOW ARE QUANTITATIVE CHARACTERISTICS HANDLED (iii) WHICH STATISTIC USE IN FINAL SCORE? (iv) ARE BOUNDARY VARIETIES USED? (v) CONVERSIONS TO SCORES DONE WITHIN YEARS OR OVER YEARS? (vi) HOW ARE NON-UPOV CHARACTERS INCLUDED?	1-9 SCORE NAME/CODES 1-9 SCORE OR ± CONTROL MEDIAN/RANGE WITHIN YEARS AS UPOV	N/A PLOT MEANS ADJUSTED MEAN MAJOR CHAR OVER YEARS AS UPOV	SCORED MEASURED - MEAN TO 1-9 SCALE MEAN NO OVER YEARS REPORTED UNDER 'GENERAL' HEADING	SCORED SCORED MEAN TO 1-9 SCALE MEAN NO OVER YEARS AS UPOV	SCORED 1-9 SCORED 1-9 MEAN NO WITHIN YEARS AS UPOV	- LINEAL REGRESSION YES OVER YEARS AS UPOV	SCORED SCORED MEAN/MEDIAN YES SOME OVER YEARS AS UPOV	- - MEAN WITHIN YEARS SPECIAL REMARKS	SCORED 1-9 SCORED 1-9 MEAN OVER YEARS AS UPOV	1-9 USING MEAN ACCEPTED = 5 1-9 USING ALL KNOWN VARS MEAN YES WITHIN YEARS AS UPOV OR EBC	1-9 UPOV SCALE ANALYSIS OF PLOT MEANS MEAN YES AS REMARKS	PARTLY CODED MEASURED SOME TRANS FORM MEAN & MODE YES OVER YEARS AS REMARKS	N/A PLOT MEANS MEAN MAJOR CHAR OVER YEARS AS UPOV	1-9 SCORES NAMES/CODES 1-9 SCORES OR ± CONTROL MEAN MAJOR CHAR WITHIN YEARS AS UPOV	
III. OUTPUT CONTENTS AND FORMAT (i) STATUTORY CHARACTERISTICS? (ii) YEARLY OR OVER YEAR RESULTS? (iii) HOW IS RESTRICTED OR MISSING DATA HANDLED? (iv) BOTANICAL NAMES? (v) RESULTS RELATIVE TO CONTROLS? (vi) HOW ARE SCORES TRANSLATED TO STATE NAMES (vii) HOW ARE RESULTS PRESENTED IF 'MEAN' NOT STATE VALUE? (viii) STANDARD UPOV 'NOTES' USED?	± UPOV OVER YEAR N/A YES NO N/A AS STATE NAMES USED RANGE YES	UPOV OVER YEAR ADJUSTED FITOON MEANS YES NO LINEAR RANGE N/A YES	UPOV OR EBC OVER YEAR ONLY MEAN AVAILABLE YES(NO) NO DIRECTLY FROM SCORES NEAREST YES	UPOV + OVER YEAR N/A YES - - - - - - - - - - - -	UPOV OVER YEAR - NO DIRECTLY FROM SCORES USE MEAN YES	UPOV OVER YEAR - NO CODES TO NAMES - - - - - - - -	- EACH YEAR - NO CODES STATE NO. & STATE NAME USE MEAN YES	- EACH YEAR - YES NO DIRECTLY FROM SCORES - YES	UPOV OVER YEAR ONLY MEAN AVAILABLE YES NO NOT TRANSLATED NEAREST YES	EBC EACH YEAR ONLY YEARS PRESENT NO SOME DIRECTLY FROM SCORES ROUND UP YES	NONE EACH YEAR - YES NO NOT TRANSLATED N/A YES	UPOV ± OVER YEAR - YES YES MANUALLY FROM SCORES RANGE COVERING MEAN YES YES	UPOV OVER YEAR N/A YES YES NOT TRANSLATED - YES	UPOV EACH YEAR N/A YES YES CODES TO NAMES - YES	

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON CURRENT PRODUCTION/USE OF VARIETY DESCRIPTIONS. (Contd)

	UK	UK	UK	UK	JAPAN	SPAIN	FRANCE	GERMANY	DENMARK	DENMARK	SOUTH AFRICA	HUNGARY	EIRE	EIRE
	CEREALS	GRASSES	VEGETABLES	ROOT/RAPE ETC					GRASS/CEREALS	VEG/RAPE ETC			HERBAGE	CEREALS
IV. USE (i) STATUTORY NATIONAL LIST? (ii) STATUTORY PBR? (iii) SEED CERTIFICATION? (iv) OTHER (GENE BANK ETC)	YES YES YES NONE	YES YES YES (SOME) NONE	YES YES YES NONE	YES YES SOME CROPS NONE	NO YES NO NONE	YES YES YES NONE	YES YES YES YES	YES YES YES NONE	YES YES YES GENE BANK	YES YES NO NONE	YES YES NO NONE	YES YES YES GENETIC RESOURCE	YES YES YES -	YES YES YES -
V. STORAGE (i) ARE COMPLETE DESCRIPTIONS STORED? (ii) IS REMOTE ACCESS POSSIBLE (iii) FULL RAW DATA STORED TO ALLOW DESCRIPTION TO BE RE-RUN	NO NO NO (YES)	NO NO YES	NO NO NO (YES)	NO NO NO	YES NO YES	NO NO OVER YEAR MEANS STORED	YES NO YES	NO NO NO	NO NO NO	NO NO NO	NO NO NO	NO NO YES	NO NO NO	NO NO NO
VI. SPECIAL PRINTING EQUIREMENTS (i) DIRECT PHOTOLITHOGRAPHY? (ii) UPPER & LOWER CASE REQUIRED? (iii) ITALICS FONT REQUIRED? (iv) DIAGRAMS INCLUDED?	NO YES NO NO	NO NO NO NO	YES YES NO NO	NO YES NO NO	YES JAPANESE CHARACTERS NO	NO NO NO NO	NO NO NO NO	YES NO NO NO	NO YES NO NO	NO YES NO NO	YES YES NO NO	NO NO NO NO	NO NO NO NO	NO NO NO NO
VII. SOFTWARE (i) COMMERCIAL SOFTWARE? (ii) USER SOFTWARE? LANGUAGES ETC	NO (REPORTER) NO (BASE II) BASIC	NO 'DUST' PACKAGE- FORTRAN 66	NO (BASE II) NO (BASE II) BASIC	NO NO	NO YES FORTRAN 66	NO YES BASIC	NO YES FORTRAN 66	NO NO	YES NO	NO NO	YES -	NO NO	NO 'DUST' PACKAGE FORTRAN66	NO NO
NOTES ON FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS	FULLY INTEGRATED COMPUTER SYSTEM BEING DEVELOPED AT NIAB, UK		FULLY INTEGRATED COMPUTER SYSTEM BEING DEVELOPED AT DAFS, UK & NIAB, UK FOR ORNAMENTAL SPECIES AND PEAS									WILLING TO USE ANY UFOV APPROVED SOFTWARE FOR THIS TASK	DEVELOPING A COMPUTER SYSTEM FOR VARIETY DESCRIPTION PRODUCTION	DITTO

**GROUPE D'ÉTUDE ET DE CONTRÔLE
DES VARIÉTÉS ET DES SEMENCES**

ANNEX VI

RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE
MINISTÈRE DE L'AGRICULTURE

INRA - GEVES



LA MINIÈRE
78280 GUYANCOURT - FRANCE

INSTITUT NATIONAL DE LA RECHERCHE AGRONOMIQUE

Tél. : (3) 043.81-13

C. C. P. Paris 9062-33

Télex : INRAMIN 698.450 F
préciser GEVES-VAR

Références à rappeler :

LA MINIÈRE - G. E. V. E. S. 43

V/Réf. : T.W.C/1/4, VIII

Objet :

La Minière, le

Subject : Presentation of the Assessment method of Maize varieties
with a view to registration in the French catalogue.

1 - Choice of control varieties

The control varieties which are selected for a given area are chosen from the three official controls by taking the two which have the best indices (as described later) over the mean of two years of trial (yield - earliness - resistance).

The index of each control is calculated in relation to the mean of the three experimental controls.

2 - Index of the candidate varieties

V = varieties

T = control

2.1. Yield :

Each variety assumes a score which is equal to the ratio of its yield and the yield of the two best controls ; the mean of the controls having the score 100.

$$R_v(\%) = \frac{R_v}{R_t}$$

2.2. Earliness

The index of earliness is based on the humidity of the harvested grain (NR), in considering :

- the harvested trials at a high moisture level for the area : N E
- the harvested trials at an intermediate moisture level for the area : N M

The difference relative to the mean of the two selected controls is multiplied by 2.5 in order to obtain the score for earliness :

$$NR_v = \frac{NE_v + NM_v}{2} \quad NR_t = \frac{NE_t + NM_t}{2}$$

$$\text{Earliness} = P_v = (NR_t - NR_v) \times 2.5$$

2.3. Resistance

Each of the selected characters is scored separately.

The characters "lodging during growth" and "lodging at harvest" are retained :

- if the mean of the trial is at least 3% or the mean of an individual variety is 8%.
- if at least 3 trials are retained over two years of study :

a) lodging during growth = VV

$$VV = \frac{VV_t - VV_v}{2} \times 0.5$$

b) lodging at harvest = VR

$$VR = \frac{VR_t - VR_v}{2} \times 1.5$$

c) Smut (USTILAGO MAYDIS)

this character is taken into account in the index if at least 3 trials are retained over two years of study.

Linear Index between the score 0 for a percentage of affected plants greater than or equal to 25%, and the score 5 if the percentage of affected plants is 0.

TWC/II/9
Annex VI, page 3

N = Score 5	-----	0%	of plants with smut
" 4	-----	5%	" "
" 3	-----	10%	" "
" 2	-----	15%	" "
" 1	-----	20%	" "
" 0	-----	25% à 100%	" "

points of resistance "smut" = N = Nv - Nt

d) Early vigour (Resistance to cold)

Score of 1 = very sensitive to 5 = very tolerant

Each variety is scored by taking its difference relative to the mean of the two selected controls.

3 - Final Index

$$C = Rv + Pv + VV + VR + N + VD$$

	C	≥	103	Registration for cultural value	
100	≤	C	<	103	Postponement for cultural value
			<	100	Refused for cultural value

Exemple :

	R	NE	NM	NR	VV	VR	N	VD
T	70	34	30	32	10	8	4	3
V	80	32	30	31	8	4	3	4

$$Rv = \frac{80}{70} = 114,3$$

$$Pv = (32 - 31) \times 2,5 = +2,5$$

$$VV = \left(\frac{10 - 8}{2}\right) \times 0,5 = +0,5$$

$$VR = \left(\frac{8 - 4}{2}\right) \times 1,5 = +3,0$$

$$N = 3 - 4 = -1$$

$$VD = 4 - 3 = +1$$

$$C = 114,3 + 2,5 + 0,5 + 3 - 1 + 1 = 120,3$$

[Annex VII follows]

BASIC READING LIST

By the end of July 1984, the Office of the Union had received the following information on the standard books and documents considered important by the experts of the Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs:

- DE: Schulze, H.H., 1978: "Lexikon zur Datenverarbeitung", rororo-Taschenbuch Nr. 6220
- DE: Linder/Berchtold, 1979: "Elementare statistische Methoden", Uni-Taschenbücher; 796, Birkhäuser
- DE: "Biometrisches Wörterbuch", 1969, Band I und II, 2. unveränderte Auflage, VEB Deutscher Landwirtschaftsverlag, 1040 Berlin, Reinhardtstrasse 14
- DK: Cochran, W.G. & Cox, G.M., 1957: "Experimental Designs", second edition, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 611+5 pp.
- DK: Kristensen, K., 1980: "Statistisk analyse af data fra selvstaendigheds- og ensartethedsundersøgelse af sorter" Tidsskrift for Planteavl's Specialserie, Statens Planteavlskontor, Lyngby, Danmark, 133+29 pp., in Danish
- DK: LeClerg, E.L., 1966: "Significance of Experimental Design in Plant Breeding", p. 243-313, In Frey, K.J. (ed.), 1966: "Plant Breeding", The Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa, 430 pp.
- DK: Patterson, H.D. & Hunter, E.A., 1984: "Statistical Criteria for Distinctness Between Varieties of Herbage Crops", Journal of Agricultural Science, Cambridge, 102, 59-68
- DK: Patterson, H.D., Williams, E.R. & Hunter, E.A., 1968: "Block Designs for Variety Trials", Journal of Agricultural Science, Cambridge, 90, 395-400
- DK: Patterson, H.D. & Silvey, V., 1980: "Statutory and Recommended List of Crop Varieties in the United Kingdom" (with Discussion), Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A.143, 219-252
- DK: Snedecor, G.W. & Cochran, W.G., 1967: "Statistical Methods", sixth edition, The Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa, 593 pp.
- DK: Weatherup, S.T.C., 1980: "Statistical Procedures for Distinctness, Uniformity and Stability Trials", Journal of Agricultural Science, Cambridge, 94:31-46

[End of Annex VII and of document]

LIST OF ADDRESSES FOR THE MAILING OF LISTS OF VARIETIES UNDER TESTNEW ZEALAND/NOUVELLE-ZELANDE/NEUSEELAND

Mr. F.W. WHITMORE, Registrar, Plant Varieties Office, P.O. Box 24, Lincoln, Canterbury

SOUTH AFRICA/AFRIQUE DU SUD/SÜDAFRIKA

The Director, Division of Plant and Seed Control, Department of Agriculture, Private Bag X 179, Pretoria 0001

SPAIN/ESPAGNE/SPANIEN

Registro de Variedades, Instituto Nacional de Semillas y Plantas de Vivero, José Abascal 56, 28003 Madrid

SWEDEN/SUEDE/SCHWEDEN

Statens Växsortnämnd, S-171 73 Solna

SWITZERLAND/SUISSE/SCHWEIZ*

Büro für Sortenschutz, Mattenhoistrasse 5, CH-3003 Bern

UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME-UNI/VEREINIGTES KÖNIGREICH

Ms. J.M. ALLFREY, The Plant Variety Rights Office, White House Lane, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0LF

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE/VEREINIGTE STAATEN VON AMERIKA*

Mr. S.D. SCHLOSSER, Attorney, Office of Legislation and International Affairs, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20231

THE OFFICE OF UPOV/LE BUREAU DE L'UPOV/DAS VERBANDSBÜRO

UPOV, 34, chemin des Colombettes, CH-1211 Genève 20, Suisse

* Does not yet mail lists but wishes to receive others
N'envoie pas encore des listes mais souhaite recevoir les autres
Versendet bis jetzt noch keine Listen, möchte jedoch die anderen erhalten.

subject : plan of a common structure of data on protection of new varieties of plants.

reference : UPOV Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs.

Proposed for a standardized list of varietal denomination.

1. Proposed organization

1.1. Procedure

Informations on protection and variety denominations will be able to be managed by a limited number of member states secretariats, each of them managing one of more groups of species.

All member organizations will be able to have at their disposal a thorough information (at UPOV level) on varieties and denominations by applying to the country which manages the information of the group of species concerned.

1.2. Rules

- a- Harmonization of structures of information on protection and denominations between the various member states of UPOV.
- b- Possibility of consulting an annual edition of reference for one group of species.
- c- Possibility of questioning via international networks by secretariats of member states and contingently by professionals in plant varieties.

2. Realization of the plan

2.1. Frame of the plan

The countries which wish to take part in the realization of the plan could make a working sub-group charged with defining:

- a- a recommendation of standard for the structure of data.
- b- a recommendation of standard for the presentation of editions and their periodicity.
- c- a proposal of distribution of groups of species to manage between the various candidate countries.
- d- a study of the possibilities of standard for interactive questioning of the bases of data.

2.2. Realization

Each member state responsible for a group of species will realize the software from the recommendations adopted at UPOV level.

In view of the diversity of environments of the various member states, it seems uneasy to realize a single software.

However this question must be tackled because it could enable to realize important savings.

3. Technical aspects

3.1. Standardization of editions and of questionings

The fields of description of data will be at international format when it exists (countries, addresses codes, etc..) according to ISO conventions.

Editions and questionings will have to be possible either in (i) condensed mode, understood by all the members, or (ii) in the language of the interlocutor concerned.

Tables of conversion based on the above mentioned example will be usefully defined.

3.2. Structure of data

Data for one variety and its denomination are arranged in two sub-unities (i) one presenting the "common" informations which don't depend on the organization creating information, (ii) the other presenting the informations "attendance of record" connected with the establisher of the information.

3.2.1. "Common informations" Structure

Common informations include minimum usefull information for all consultation of data, on an edited or under questioning document.

3.2.2. "Attendance of record" Structure

The structure of "attendance of record" is made of one basis unit repeated at each event of the variety life or denomination. This unit structure inspired from British pattern has the advantage of taking into account all the possibilities of events, even those which are not expected to day.

The informations are coded. The editions or questionings will be realized either by using these codes, or in "talkative" mode in the tongue chosen by the user.

Service Informatique

page 4

3.3. Structures Proposees -- Proposed Structures

3.3.1. Informations Communes -- Common Informations

proposed structure	existing structure		
	Germany	France	Great-Britain
nom latin de l'espece long.variable (60 caracteres)		libelle d'espece 34 caracteres	latin name of species var.length
*[nom commun de l'espece 20car.]			*[common name of species 20 char]
code espece 4 chiffres	nr. der artgruppe 3 chiffres kenn buchstaben 3 caracteres	code espece 4 chiffres	species code 4 figures
*[code espece + code pays, 4+3 car.]			*[species code + country code, 4 + 3 char]
denomination 28 caracteres	sortenbezeichnung 20 caracteres	71 caracteres	variety name 28 characters
date de depot de de priorite an/mm/jj 6 chiffres	prioritatsdatum / / 6 chiffres		date of priority yy/mm/dd 6 figures
existence de synonyme 1 caractere			
code du mainteneur communautaire (code pays: 3 car. +code propre 5 car)	abkuerzung der zuechters 4 caracteres	code obtenteur 4 chiffres	breeders code 5 characters
nationalite du mainte- neur communautaire 3 caracteres	nationalitat der zuechters 3 caracteres	pays du mainteneur 3 caracteres	country code 2 characters
(*) Ces informations apparaitront dans la langue de l'interlocuteur These informations will appear in the tongue of the interlocutor			

Service Informatique
3.3.3. Structure des Suivis de Dossier - Attendance of Record

page 5

proposed structure	existing structures or translation		
	Germany	France	Great-Britain
access key :			
pays membre-country	3 caracteres	3 caracteres	3 characters
-> code espece-species	3 chiffres +	4 chiffres	3 figures +
code	3 caracteres		3 figures
code variete	4 chiffres	6 chiffres	
synonyme ou denomination abregee 28 caracteres	kurzname 8 caracteres	synonymes 28 caracteres	synonym or abrevi- ated denomination 28 characters
type d'evenement 4 caracteres			type of event 4 char.
organisme responsable de l'evenement 4 caracteres			organization res- ponsible of the event 4 chr.
nationalite de l'organisme respon- sable de l'evenement 3 caracteres			nationality of the organization res- ponsible of the event 3 chr.
document saisi 4 caracteres			seized document 4 chr.
document de premiere publication 4 caracteres			first publication document 4 chr.
date d'effet an/mm/jj 6 chiffres			working date yy/mm/dd 6 fig.
heure d'effet hh/mn/s 6 chiffres			working hour hh/mm/ss 6 fig.
statut du tiers 4 caracteres			third's status 4 chr.
numero du tiers :			third number :
pays (3 caracteres)	nationalitat 3 caracteres	pays 3 caracteres	country code 2 characters
--> code de tiers (5 chiffres)	abkuerzung 4 caracteres	code client 4 chiffres	breeders code 5 characters